PAKISTAN EXPLAINED

BY

ALP ARSLAN

NORTHERN INDIA PUBLISHERS
MOHINI ROAD, LAHORE

First edition, October, 1945

Published by
Muhammad Azam Khan
For the Northern India Publishers
Mohini Road, Lahore

Printed by
M. Muhammad Din
At the Bengal Art Press
Changar Mohallah, Anarkali, Lahore

LIST OF CONTENTS

To
The Memory of Qaid-i-Millat
Maulvi Muhammad Bahadur Khan
(Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung)

PAKISTAN EXPLAINED

INTRODUCTION

The All-India Muslim League adopted the following resolution at its Lahore Session on 23rd March, 1940:

"While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, as indicated in their resolutions dated the 27th August, 17th and 18th of September, and 22nd of October, 1939, and third of February, 1940 on the constitution issue, this Session of the All-India Muslim League emphatically reiterates that the scheme of Federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, is totally unsuited to and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India.

"It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18th of October, 1939, made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government is reassuring in so far as it declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act, 1935, is based will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties, interests and communities in India, Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered *de novo* and that no revised plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent.

"Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session

of the All-India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principles viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute "Independent States" in which the Constituent Units shall be autonomous and sovereign.

"That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specially provided in the constitution for minorities in the units and in the regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority, adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

"This Session further authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary."

This resolution has been described as the most impor-

tant event in the political life of the Muslim during the present Century. By the Muslims it is regarded as the immutable expression of their national will and the inevitable outcome of the evolution of their political life during the last hundred years. By the Hindus who form about two-third of the total population of the Indian subcontinent, it is regarded as the most alarming and calamitous resolve formed by their Muslim neighbours since the establishment of the British control. It may generally be said that the step taken by the All-India Muslim League has awakened the deepest feelings in all quarters. The resolution is popularly known as the Pakistan Resolution though the word "Pakistan" has not been used by those who have been responsible for framing it. It would appear that the word 'Pakistan' was coined many years ago by taking the first letters of the names of the provinces and states of the North-Western India. Thus P stands for the Punjab, A for the Afghan Province (the N.-W.F. Province), K for Kashmir, S for Sind and the last three letters TAN are derived from 'Baluchistan'.

The Lahore Resolution demands that the regions where a majority of the population are Muslims be constituted into independent states. There are two such regions: Western Pakistan (or Pakistan proper) in the North-West of India and Eastern Pakistan (or Bangsam i.e. portions of Bengal and Assam) in the East.

The purpose of this booklet is to trace the evolution of the forces that gave rise to the idea of Pakistan, to examine the case for Pakistan and discuss its geographical, ethno-

logical and sociological premises. A number of proposed schemes to carry out the idea of separation into effect have been briefly mentioned and the development of opinion regarding the movement in the various camps has been traced upto the present day.

THE LAND AND THE PEOPLE

The Indian Nations

India is the world in miniature. The diversity of religious, races, languages, traditions, climate and geographical features in India is greater than in any other similar area in the world. The Indian population forms one-fifth of the total world population and representatives of all the main racial groups of man live within the boundaries of India. Similarly the Indian languages are derived from various families of speech. The various parts of the Indian subcontinent have their own traditions and history and the geographical background before which the uncertain drama of human life has been played for countless centuries also varies between the greatest extremes.

Several definitions of nationhood have been laid down and the very fact that these definitions considerably differ from one another shows that no single definition can be entirely correct when applied unreservedly to any particular concrete case. Yet practical necessity obliges us to consider certain elements as being more important than others in the lives of human masses, and upon these elements we must, despite the attendant imperfections, base our division of national groups.

Modern Nationalism took its birth in post-renaissance Europe and generalisations pertaining to it can best be deduced from European examples. The various factors that determine the national being of a human group are

geographical and climatic environment, race, language, religion, history and traditions. The part played by each of these factors in giving rise to the Pakistan issue is briefly as follows.

Geographical Environment

Topographically the Indian subcontinent is highly varied. The highest mountain ranges in the world lie on the northern border. To the south of these lie the great plains of the Indus and the Ganges basins. The Indus plain receives less rainfall than the Gangetic plain and is less densely populated. It has an extreme climate and is steppe-land and partly desert. On the other hand the Ganges plain is more to the southward, is more humid and fertile and is one of the most densely populated regions on earth. "Within these frontiers" write Moreland and Chatterjee, (by frontiers they mean the mountain ranges to the north-west and east) "North India consists of the basins of two great river-systems, the Indus and the Ganges. The mountain portions of these basins are extensive, but thinly populated, and the main life of the country has been lived on the wide alluvial plains. These are broken into three divisions by wedges projecting northward from the rugged central region. Towards the west the tract known as Rajputana separates the two basins, and at one point close to Delhi the modern capital approaches the forest lying at the foot of the Himalayas, leaving a comparatively narrow gap of less than 200 miles through which invaders from the north-west have had to pass in order to reach the Gangetic plain; *a series of decisive battles have been fought at this point, and there*

have been times when the Indus plain has had a history of its own." —a remarkable statement bearing out the contention that geographically and historically north-western India (or Pakistan) is a distinct unit. The historians go on to say: "Further east, *another wedge, now called the Santal Parganas, projects northward and serves to separate the main Gangetic plain from the region known as Bengal*, where the waters of the Ganges unite with those of the Brahmputra; and in former times when the country north of the river was not easily traversed, the separation was effective *so that Bengal, too, has had its own history*." —which is a testimony to the fact that the Eastern Muslim homeland too, is a distinct geographical unit.

The Deccan plateau is more or less cut off from the great plains. It is separated from the Indus basin by the Thar sand-belt and the Satpura range and from the Gangetic plain by the forest tracts of the Central Provinces.

The southern coasts or the ghats are wholly tropical. Heavy rainfall and the perpetual summer of the tropics makes them the greenest and dampest regions in India.

The staple foods, dress and modes of life of the people of these regions are vastly different from one another. Pakistan is distinct by its dryness and its extremes of temperature, and these climatic factors have had an important effect on the staple food, dress and mode of life of the people.

There is considerable racial intermixture in India, yet a few broad facts emerge from the study of history and ethnology. The various Indian races are derived from the

three main human families viz., the white, the yellow and the black families. In the extreme east, in Assam and contiguous area the people are of the yellow mongoloid stock. The Madras presidency in the south is the home of the black Dravidian race. In the North, that is Kashmir, N.-W. F.P., Punjab and Rajputana the people are Aryans.

Racial intermixture is greatest in the central regions. In the Bombay Presidency the Dravidians and the Scythians have intermingled. Likewise in the Ganges valley the inhabitants are Aryo-Dravidian. The inhabitants of Bengal are Mongolo-Dravidian.

The inhabitants of Pakistan are descended from the earliest Aryans who migrated to India before the dawn of history. The earliest Aryans came in tribes and drove out the Dravidians from the Indus plains. Their descendents today inhabit the Indus plain and are fair, tall and hairy like their remote ancestors. Later, other waves of Aryan men, not in tribes but in armies, came into India. They crossed the Punjab plains into the Ganges valley where they married the native Dravidian women and settled down. Their descendents of mixed Aryan and Dravidian blood, inhabit the Ganges valley today and the mixture of Dravidian and Aryan traits can be seen in their physical appearance. Compared to the inhabitants of the north-west they are shorter and darker and have less hair on the face and the body.

Thus the north-west is inhabited by the descendents of the original Indo-Aryans who are racially distinct from other Indian peoples. The inhabitants of Bengal are Mon-

golo-Dravidians and possess a marked racial individuality. The Madrasis are descended from tne original Dravidians and have nothing in common with any of the Aryan races. Likewise the Mahrattas of the Bombay presidency are Scytho-Dravidian and form a distinct racial unit.

Religion in India

The two main Indian religions are Hinduism and Islam. Jains, Sikhs, Zoroastrians, Christians and Budhists form very small minorities in India as a whole. The Sikhs have an important place in the North-West (i.e. Western Pakistan) where they are a minority of about 9% of the population. In India taken as a whole they are less than 1·3%.

Hinduism and Islam are, in many ways, as far apart as can possibly be imagined. Hinduism is an all-embracing label for a great civilization. According to Hindu belief the affairs of the world are managed by a number of gods and goddesses who are propitiated by offerings and by feeding the holy priestly caste. Besides the universal, tribal and household gods, the Hindus also worship a number of animal and vegetable forms (viz. cows, monkeys, snakes, certain trees and bushes, etc.).

The great Hindu Society is divided into a number of castes and subcastes. These divisions are understood to have been created in the beginning of the world and cannot be abolished by any earthly power. The highest caste are the holy Brahmins and the lowest the Sudras. There is considerable difference of status between the castes. The higher castes must guard themselves against ceremonial

pollution; thus a Brahmin may be polluted if a Sudra touches him or if the shadow of a Sudra falls upon him. A Sudra may not hear the holy Vedantic scriptures chanted or recited by a Brahmin Thus intermarriages or interdining between high and low castes is unthinkable.

The holy books of the Hindus are the Vedas, the Puranas and the Shastras. These contain grand hymns to gods and goddesses, mantras, charms, spells, incantations and philosophical teachings. There are considerable variations in belief among the various Hindu sects The life of the masses is governed by custom law which varies with different sects. A Hindu authority defined Hinduism as "What the Hindus or a major portion of the Hindus do" and there is the greatest diversity of belief and action among the hundreds of millions of Indian Hindus living over an area of hundred of thousands of square miles. Thus there are Hindu sects the members of which sweep the place where they are going to sit for fear of inadvertenly causing the death of a living being, and there are others which offer animal sacrifices to propitiate certain deities.

Sir T. W. Holderness says, "A distinguished English authority described it (Hinduism) as the collection of rites, worships, beliefs, traditions and mythologies sanctioned by the sacred books and ordinances of the Brahmins and are propagated by Brahmanic teaching. Popular Hinduism is largely a social system whose chief tenets are veneration for Brahmans, the caste system, the doctrine of Karma and transmigration of souls and holiness of the cow But the basis of the whole fabric is the divine right of the Brahmans."

Islam on the other hand teaches that there is no god but God, that all men are equal and the same law applies to them The Islamic law makes no distinctions between human beings as such. The idea of racial superiority or inferiority is opposed to the tenets of Islam Hospitality to strangers is enjoined by the Quran and distinction between rich and poor is offensive in the sight of God. In the house of prayer the king and the porter at his gate must stand shoulder to shoulder and pray as men before their Maker.

The Muslim jurists have worked out an elaborate Islamic code which lays down the laws of action and belief for the guidance of Muslims in all affairs of life. Instructions in minute detail regarding personal hygiene, food, dress, rights of friends and strangers, marriage, divorce. inheritence, trade, barter, loans, punishment for moral offences, obligations towards the state, taxation, war, treatment of the conquered and other aspects of social and individual life are laid down in Muslim Law, the extensive discussions and exposition of which recognises the unchangeable referendum—the Quran.

The lives of the Hindus and the Muslims are profoundly affected by their religions. Their ethical and cultural values which lie at the bottom of national consciousness are entirely different and Hindus and Muslims find their interests clashing in every walk of life. The cleavage is not recent or superficial but fundamental and time-hardened. With the modernisation of India and spreading of political consciousness the Hindu-Muslim antagonism which was dormant and sporadic has come to the forefront as organised consti-

tutional strife. Finding that the mutual distrust can never be dispelled, and being the smaller nation, the Muslims have decided to cast their lot apart from the Hindus and ensure their freedom and soverignty by making a national home in the vast regions of the East and the North-West where they are in a majority.

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT

As a whole India is an agricultural country but during the recent decades the pace of industrialisation has been very rapid in certain regions. The cloth industry in Bombay and Madras areas, the iron and steel industry in Bihar, the jute industry in Bengal and various other minor industries all over the country have assumed considerable proportions. The North-West and some other regions are predominently agricultural and their economic interests are therefore different from the interests of the industrialised areas.

The industrial interests (largely Hindu) would demand protection against foreign competition in the home-market, while the agriculturist consumers would naturally desire that manufacturers should come into the country duty-free and competition be allowed to develop so that they might be able to buy the best goods at the cheapest rates. Again it would be in the interests of the industrialists to keep the prices of raw materials low and they would insist that foreign foodstuffs be permitted to enter the country duty-free as that would mean foodstuffs would be cheapened and factory workers would be able to accept low wages leaving large margins of profits to the industrial capitalists. Thus, as far as tariff policy is concerned, the agricultural and industrial interests would be entirely opposed in a federated India.

In his *Confederacy of India* 'a Punjabi' advocating the separationist movement has summed up the case of the

Muslim North-West in the following words:

"In all-India affairs or foreign affairs they (the Muslims) will have no voice as they will have no hand in the formation of the policies of the Central Government Even their local economic interests may also depend upon the central governing body, the federal assembly. Would it not be a temptation to the capitalists and industrialists of Hindu provinces to reserve the raw material produced in the Muslim block in the North-West of India for themselves and also to secure markets here for their finished goods? What guarantee is there that they would abstain from exerting their influence with the Central Assembly to adopt a protectionist policy and to raise high tariff walls against foreign goods, so that in the absence of the foreign competition they may flourish better? If they succeeded in doing so, would it not mean dependence of the present agricultural province on the industrial provinces for the sale of their raw material and purchase of manufactures? Would it not mean decrease in the price of raw material and increase in the price of manufactures on account of lack of competition among the industrialists?"

Being predominently agricultural the North-West will make payments for its imports in the shape of export of raw materials. At present Pakistan (the North-West) forms a market for the finished products of the countries which absorb most of Pakistan's exports of raw materials. A tariff policy which aims at giving protection to Indian industry will, in the event of Pakistan being joined to the rest of India, cause a decrease in Pakistan's imports of

foreign goods which in its turn will result in a decrease in the capacity of those countries to absorb Pakistan's exports of raw materials. Thus Pakistan will lose her foreign markets for raw materials and will be compelled to sell her produce to Hindu India in exchange for protected, competition-free and consequently bad manufactured goods. In his *Wealth and Welfare of the Punjab* Mr. H. Calvert cites the example of the heavy import duty levied on Japanese textile goods which resulted in the fall of prices paid by Japan for Indian raw cotton. Mr. Calvert draws a parallel between India and Australia and discusses the case of Australia at length where the investiture of the power to impose tarrifs in the Central Federal Government resulted in the interests of the agricultural West being prejudicially affected. He writes, ".. in 1901 the various states were federated into the commonwealth of Australia and to the Central Government was allotted, as means of raising revenue, the power to impose tariffs. In the following year the tendency of Federal Government went more and more towards the protection of industries at the expense of agriculture and the fact that such industries as there were, were concentered in one small portion only of the vast continent did not convey to the protectionists any idea of the incongruity of their policy... Western Austria finds that she has to pay for the protection of the Eastern industries without deriving any advantage from them, while she receives no federal help in the marketing of her surplus wheat and wool. The parallel with India goes a little further. In Australia the import of sugar is prohibited in order to secure

a market for the product of a factory in the extreme east; all Australia has to pay more for its sugar just as well India has to pay more for its iron and steel in order to benefit a single factory in Bihar, or more for its cloth just to benefit shareholders in factories in a few towns, mostly in one province. In the United States similar attempts are being made by the agricultural states to secede from the federation. In Australia the huge province of Western Australia has petitioned His Majesty the King for permission to secede from the federation. Her agriculture is being ruined by industrial protection and her only salvation in the opinion of her leaders, lies in secession."

There are other passages in Mr. Calvert's work of so great significance that they cannot be left out of any discussion of the economics of Pakistan. Mr. Calvert says, "There can be little doubt that if the facts were only better known, all the agricultural provinces of India like the Punjab would likewise claim exclusion from an urban dominated federation.

"In Australia, the concentration of the population in a small industrial area in the south-east gives control of the federal parliament to the representatives of the one corner of the continent and these are deaf to the arguements that the rural areas bear all the burdens of protection without reaping any of its advantages. It is to be feared that in India the caste fellows of the small industrial population will blindly vote for protection despite the clearest proofs that the provinces they represent have no industries to protect or at any rate no industries benefiting from protection and,

therefore, like Western Australia are paying for others while getting nothing in exchange.

"The great activities of distribution will remain in other hands; the railways, the post and telegraphs, communications, overseas and port facilities and costs will all remain outside provincial autonomy. Prices will continue to be largely determined by extraneous influences including of course the effects of the policies of the Central Government in regard to import and export duties, currency and exchange."

Pakistan with an area several times the area of Great Britain, would, in a closely federated India, be reduced to the status of an agricultural hinterland. The non-Pakistani 'big business and high finance' would, by reason of its control of capital, be able to influence the central federal legislation with regard to industry and would seek to keep the North-West unindustrialized so that these vast areas might always remain a ready market for finished goods. Under existing conditions big industry can, by forming pools and combines, entirely eliminate non-cooperating elements from the economic field and can effectually suppress rising enterprise which might threaten competition in any market. Thus Pakistan will not be able to develop its industry unless it cuts itself adrift economically from the rest of India. Government action alone can combat the anti social designs of capitalistic conspiracies and no new industry can establish itself in any region unless nursed and protected by the political power. An independent Government alone, through bounties, subsides and protection, can help industry to take root in Pakistan.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Dawn of Islam

Arabia in the later half of the sixth century was "a land cut off from the world." A few lacs of white people of the semitic race lived a precarious, nomadic life in the oases of a great sand-desert. Given to inter-tribal warfare and lacking political organisation they were among the most backward of civilized people on earth They held no commerce with the outside world, built no fine buildings and evolved no great art.

But this race of desert dwellers was destined to deflect the course of human evolution. Muhammad the Prophet of Islam was born amidst them and led by him they carried their inspired faith to the ends of the world. In less than half a century Islam spread as far as Spain and Morocco in the West and China and Malaya in the East. In Central Asia the ferocious Tartar people fell under the influence of the religion of God and scores of Sultanates sprang up in the vast regions between Europe and India. For the first time in known history the wild and turbulent nations of the Near East came under law and order.

Islam in India

The history of pre-Muslim India is, to a large extent, based upon conjecture. The Turks who began their invasions of India in the eleventh century first brought the art of writing history into the sub-continent. "Along with the creed," say Moreland and Chatterjee of the Muslim kings,

"they had accepted the culture of Islam as it came to them by way of Persia. The royal courts were elaborate and well-ordered; there was an organised administration, conducted in the Persian language; the rulers were discriminating patrons of literature, great builders and cultivated men. One feature of the new culture calls for special mention: the Turks who were already familiar with the use of paper, brought to India the practice of writing chronicles based on the Islamic calendar and henceforward the chronology of India becomes precise, so far as the facts recorded in the chronicle are concerned."

For seven centuries various Muslim dynasties ruled India and brought new ideas in the fields of civil administration, art and architecture, religion and ethics. The Muslim Indian civilization attained the peak of its glory during the reign of the wise and large-hearted Mughals. The work of the Indian painters, poets, chronicle-writers and builders under the Mughal-Rajput Emperors was unequalled in the contemporary world and will remain unequalled in many ways for all time.

Indian society had been completely transformed during the seven centuries of close contact with the Muslims, and Persian cultural elements were so readily assimilated in the native Indian civilization that it is difficult adequately to judge the extent of the transformation, or to say with certainty what elements of Mughal-Rajput culture were foreign and what others native Indian. Suffice it to say that had the Mughal power persisted for another century and half India or the greater part of Aryan India might have emerged

a unified nation-state; and might, by reason of its large population, its fertility and resources and the skill and culture of its inhabitants, have emerged in the vanguard of world progress.

In the preface to his "Decline and Fall of the Mughal Empire" Sir Jadunath Sarkar writes: "The birth of the New India in which we live was preceded by the death of a political and social order under which the millions of this country had been nurtured for two centuries and a half and which had done great things for them The Mughal Empire, established in 1556, and united much of the Indian continent under one sceptre, given it a uniform civilization whose conquering light had penetrated beyond the bounds of that empire and on the whole promoted the the general happiness of the people in a degree unaproached except in the mythical past. It broke the isolation of the provinces and the barrier between India and the outer world, and thus took the first step necessary for the modernization of India and the growth of an Indian nationality in some distant future... But the exhaustion of this civilizing force with the consequent ruin of this country has hitherto repelled historians, probably because of the dismal nature of the subject which presents no spectacle calculated to elevate the human mind or warm the human bosom."

The Advent of the British

The history of India between the death of Aurangzeb and the capture of the last Mughal Emperor by the British in 1858 is the story of the Indian kingdoms going down one by one before the foreign power. The total disintegration

of the great Indian political entities was due partly to fortune and a great deal to treachery and mutual jealousies. Mysore, Bengal, Oudh fell one by one to the British. The greatest Indian power, the Mahrattas, were shattered by Ahmad Shah Abdali in the fatal third battle of Panipat. Later the Sikhs fell out among themselves and brought about their own ruin, and thus the way was cleared for the British to establish their control all over India. The Mutiny of 1857 was the last armed effort to throw off the British yoke but once more the internecine differences proved more powerful than loyalty to the ancient throne of Delhi and the British were established more firmly than ever.

Muslims under early British Rule

During the days of the East India Company the British had wrested power inch by inch from the various Muslim kingdoms and principalities. Even since the time when the Emperor Shah Alam had granted the Dewany of Bengal to "our loyal and beloved servants, the East India Company," the Company's policy was aimed at decreasing the economic, social and martial strength of the dominant Muslim race. In his *Our Indian Mussalmans* Dr. Hunter says, "When the country passed under our rule the Mussalmans were the superior race and superior not only in stoutness of heart and strength of arm, but in power of political organisation and in the science of practical government...

"Before the country passed under our rule the Mussalmans in all essentials lived the same life as they do now. To this day they exhibit at intervals their old intense feel-

ing and capability of warlike enterprise but in all other aspects they are a race ruined under British Rule."

To put down the Muslims the British substituted Hindus in places of power and prestige heretofore occupied by the Muslims. Muslim ownership of land was nullified by legislation and their Hindu rent-collectors were put in the place of their masters. Dr. Hunter writes, "A hundred and seventy years ago it was almost impossible for a well-born Mussalman in Bengal to become poor; at present it is almost impossible for him to continue rich"

Thus the seeds of Hindu-Muslim antagonism took root and the gap between the two peoples widened till it became the insurmountable chasm of to-day.

The Mutiny and its Results

The Mutiny of 1857 was the last flicker of Indian resistance after which Indian nationhood died for ever. The inhabitants of the Gangetic plain made a last desperate attempt to put their Shahinshah, (in the words of Mill, "the forlorn emperor, the representative of so illustrious a race, who possesses hardly a roof to protect him") in possession of real power once again, but nature intervened. The diversities and distances of the great subcontinent made themselves felt and the British were joined by the Sikhs from the Pakistan regions and other Indian peoples in crushing the resurgence of Hindustani nationalism.

The British wrongly, though not unnaturally, regarded the mutiny as having been engineered by the Muslims. Muslims had, till that time, been the masters and rulers of the country. Indian leadership was largely Muslim. Tech-

nically the East India Company were vassals of the Indian Emperor who was a Muslim and while Hindus became scribes and clerks in the Company's employ and acquired European learning, the Muslims looked upon the knowledge of the West with disdain and regarded service of the British unworthy of themselves as the ruling race.

Although the Hindus had taken as prominent a part in the mutiny as the Muslims, and though many of the leaders of the mutineers were, like Nana Farnavis and the Rani of Jhansi, Hindu, yet the British by reason, perhaps, of their erstwhile possession of power and independent spirit, laid the blame largely on the Muslims and refused them admission into public services Hindus monopolised the lower position in the administration ; while the Muslims deprived of wealth, education and power, sank low in life. Says Sir Theodore Morrison : "In 1857 came the catastrophe of the Mutiny, for which, the English believed wrongly that the Muslims were mainly responsible; the phantom of the Mughal Emperor was abolished, the noble families which had followed his fallen fortunes were ruined or dispersed and Delhi ceased to be a Muslim city. All over India Muslim civilization was in evident decay. The Maulvis, the religious leaders of the people from a mistaken loyalty to Islam, forbade their followers under pain of eternal damnation from acquiting the knowledge of the Firangis (Franks i e. Europeans). The Muslims were thereby excluded from all the liberal professions . . . While Bengalis, Hindus, Madrasis and Mahrattas inspired by the arts and sciences of Europe were experiencing an intellectual and moral

renaissance, the Muslims all over India were falling into a state of material indigence and intellectual decay."

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan

Thus when in 1885 when the Indian National Congress was formed, the Muslims, estranged from the Hindus and lacking European education, took very little interest in it. On the other hand they assembled under the leadership of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan on the platform of the Mohammadan Educational Conference and openly expressed their dissociation from the Congress. Later, when the Congress began to launch political agitation, Sir Syed realised that very little of the power they wanted to capture would fall to the share of the Muslims who would be placed, in the words of Principal Beck of Aligarh College, "under the majority opinion of the Hindus, a thing which will be highly resented by them and which, I am sure, they will not accept quietly."

Hindu-Muslim Relations

The rift between the Hindus and Muslims widened when the Hindi-Urdu controversy began in the United Provinces. The Hindus demanded the removal of the Urdu language and the Persian script and their replacement by Hindi and Deva Nagri script in Government offices. Agitation was kept up for several years till by 1900 Urdu had been banished from the Government offices in Bihar and the United Provinces.

Hindu aggressiveness gradually aroused the Muslims and drove them to a united platform. The expulsion of Urdu was felt by the Muslims as a national calamity. They

made protests and representations and were rebuffed. Finally the Nawabs Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Viqar-ul-Mulk founded a Muslim Association to organize the Muslims politically and socially.

In 1883 Bal Gangadhar Tilak had founded his movement for the protection of cows. The sole active work that could be done by his followers was the creation of Anti-Muslim feeling, for the Muslims were the only considerable element in the country who did not worship the cows and who ate beef. Tilak succeeded so well that Hindu-Muslim riots made their appearance on the political stage and have been a feature of Indian politics ever since. At the same time anti-British feeling was also roused, for the British, too, eat beef.

The Partition of Bengal

Next came the partition of Bengal in 1905. For administrative reasons it was considered expedient to separate East Bengal and make it a separate province. The population of East Bengal is largely Muslim and in case the area was made into a separate province, there was likelihood of the Bengal Muslims getting some share in the administration of their country which in Bengal as whole was dominated and monopolised by Bengal Hindus. As the scheme took shape the Muslims welcomed it for it afforded them the opportunity of freeing themselves to a certain extent from Hindu domination and of making good the losses that they had suffered; but the Bengali Hindus virulently attacked it, for it lessened their chances of exploiting the Muslim masses. The Hindus were roused to a pitch of

fury at the prospect of the Muslims standing a chance of getting some of their rights, and launched an extensive agitation. The Congress leaders openly declared themselves in the Hindu camp and the Hindu-Muslim differences changed their character from communal rivalry to something deeper, more lasting and more tragic.

Dr. Ambedkar is not usually charitable to Muslims. After the method of the authoress of *Mother India* he selects episodes and quotations from the limitless quarries of the Indian press to paint the Muslims blacker than nature ever made any people. Yet the rebuffs and terrible injustice that his own people, the so-called "untouchables," have met at the hands of the Hindus make him tell some home-truths about them. In his *Thoughts on Pakistan* he discusses the selfish acquisitiveness of the Hindus and says, "The opposition of the Bengali Hindus to the partition of Bengal is another illustration of this trait of the high caste Hindus. The Bengali Hindu has the whole of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Assam and even U. P. for his pasture. It meant that the Bengali Hindu was to be ousted from Eastern Bengal to make room for the Bengali Musalmans who had so far no place in the civil service of Bengal. The opposition to the partition of Bengal on the part of the Bengali Hindus was due principally to their desire not to allow the Bengali Musalmans to take their places in Eastern Bengal. Little did the Bengali Hindu dream that by opposing partition and at the same time demanding Swaraj he was preparing the way for making the Musalmans the rulers of both Eastern as well as Western Bengal."

At last the Muslims realized that in their Hindu neighbours they had to deal not with brother countrymen but with inexorable rivals who sought to thwart them in the realization of their barest rights. They now clearly foresaw that to maintain their bare existence as a people they would have to discard all internal differences and gather on a common political platform. The Muslim leaders began to think of forming an organization to resist the rising Hindu opposition and aggressiveness.

EARLY DAYS OF THE LEAGUE

The Simla Deputation

Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk prepared an extensive programme of work in which the famous Simla Deputation was included. The Government was then envisaging the Morley-Minto reforms by which it was intended to establish popular semi-representative councils at the centre as well as in the provinces. Had the elected element been returned to these councils in the ordinary way, there was every likelihood that the Hindu majority would have swamped the Muslim minority. The only method of averting this danger was separate electorate and reservation of seats in the executive for the Muslims. Thirty-six prominent Muslims representing every province and every class of Muslims led by His Highness the Agha Khan waited upon the Viceroy and succeeded in obtaining separate electorate for the Muslims—a step which marks a turning point in the official policy of the Government of India.

The Muslim League Formed

In the same year Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk convened the All-India Educational Conference at Dacca. A large concourse of eminent Muslims from all over the country attended the Conference and the Nawab of Dacca availed of the opportunity to move a resolution envisaging the formation of a Political Association styled the All-India Muslim League for the purpose of protecting and advancing the political rights and interests of the Musalmans of India and to re-

present their needs and aspirations to the Government.

In the meanwhile the Hindu agitation against the partition of Bengal went on apace. In the west Bal Gangadhar Tilak's gymnastic societies, his Anti-Cow-killing movement and his extremist press with its note of personal violence were all directed against the Muslims and the British. "He not only convoked popular meetings," writes Sir Valentine Chirol, "in which his firy eloquence denounced the Mohammadans as the sworn foes of Hinduism but he started an organisation known as the Anti-Cow-killing Society which was intended and regarded as a direct provocation to the Mohammadans, who like ourselves, think it no sacrilege to eat beef." Tilak had revived organised worship of Ganesh and appealed to the Hindus in the name of Sivaji (who had, during Aurangzeb's reign, treacherously murdered a Muslim general come to parley with him under the flag of truce) to undermine the position of the Muslims by fair and foul means.

In October 1905 the partition of Bengal had been effected. Hindu opposition in Bengal followed the pattern of Tilak's revivalism of religious fanaticism and violence. The Bengali Hindus appealed to Kali, the goddess of strength and destruction to aid them against their opponents. They boycotted British goods and stopped buying from Muslim shops. A violently anti-Muslim song *Bande-matram* written by a Bengali extremist was adopted as the Hindu national anthem. Hindu-Muslim antagonism could now no longer remain within the bounds of law. It took the shape of sporadic warfare, called "rioting" in official language, all

over the country.

The Muslim League supported the Partition scheme and gathered strength. The tone of the League press and platform was one of abject loyalty to the Government, for the British at that juncture stood for partition. When however, in 1911 the partition was annulled the Muslims were staggered. They felt that they had abased themselves before the British and the British had let them down. Lord Minto, speaking in the House of Lords, said, " We told the Mussalmans that the partition was a settled fact, and we over and over again asserted that it must continue to be so. We assured the Mussalman population of Eastern Bengal of our appreciation of their loyalty and our determination to safeguard their interests. I should think there could have been scarcely a civil servant in India who had not declared that it would be impossible for the British Government to reverse the decision it had come to as regards the maintenance of the partition of Bengal."

The Muslim attitude towards the British was profoundly affected by the repeal of the Partition of Bengal. Shortly after this the Balkan possessions of Turkey, the premier Muslim state in the world, were attacked by the neighbouring states with British moral support. The Indian Mussalmans felt profoundly for their Turkish co-religionists and resented Britain's reversal of her traditional policy of support to Turkey. Affairs in other Islamic countries were none too re-assuring. The Italians had attacked Tripoli, and Persia was suffering from Russian aggressiveness. The Indian Muslims, rebuffed at home, watched these develop-

ments abroad in dismay and were disposed to grasp the first hand that was held out to them.

Hindu-Muslim Co-operation

The Congress was now advancing from strength to strength. Some eminent Congress leaders were anxious to enlist the support of the Muslims in the name of Indian patriotism. The Muslims, oppressed and despondent, gradually drifted from their loyalist policy and drew nearer the Congress. A few months after the firing on a Muslim crowd in Cawnpore in 1913, the All-India Muslim League at its session at Lucknow adopted a resolution declaring that the aim of the League was the establishment of responsible self-government in India.

This declaration of a change of creed caused the Congress and the League to come closer, and efforts of leaders on both sides resulted in the two organisations joining hands on a common platform. The eminent Congress leaders attended the League sessions. During the Bombay session of the League in 1915 the scheme of reforms for India was formulated and the Congress welcomed the proposals. In 1916 a joint meeting of the All-India Congress Committee and the Council of the Muslim League was held in Calcutta. In the same year the Congress Committee and the Reform Committee of the League met together in Lucknow and drew up a joint scheme of reform as a definite stage in the country's progress towards self-government.

The Great War broke out in 1914, and India, being a dependency of the British Crown, joined it. All Indian political organisations voiced their unequivocal support of

Britian and her Allies, and among them the Congress and the League were prominent. The war brought a number of calamities on the Muslims states and peoples and the Indian Mussalmans anguished in sympathy. The dismemberment of the Turkish Empire and Britain's share in it was deeply resented by the Indian Muslims who nevertheless fought for the Allies in every theatre of the war. The intransigent attitude of the British drove the Muslims into the arms of the Congress. It appeared as if the Hindu-Muslim differences had been setlled. A spirit of co-operation and mutual accomodation pervaded the country although signs were not lacking that deep down the rift remained as before. The Hindu Mahasabha met at Lucknow and repudiated the claim of the Congress to speak for the Hindus. The same Hindus who acquiesced in the Muslim demand for separate electorate in the Congress-cum-League deliberations, attended sessions of the Mahasabha and opposed the Muslims there.

In 191 the League Council and the Congress Committee jointly decided that a petition be sent to the Parliament supporting the League-Congress demands and calling for an authoritative pronouncement regarding India's prospects of attaining self-government. Accordingly on 20th August, 1917 the Secretary of State for India made the following announcement:

"The policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of the self-

governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire."

The Congress and the League were in full agreement with the aims of Mrs. Besant's Home Rule League which had set up a considerable agitation throughout the country for the achievement of Home Rule resulting in the internment of several prominent leaders in gaols.

The publication of the Montague-Chelmsford Report drew a storm of disapproval from the League-Congress platform. The recommendations of the Commission fell far short of Indian expectations. Later, the Rowlett Bill caused disappointment and indignation all over the country. During the agitation that followed, the terrible tragedy of Jallianwala Bagh occurred in Amritsar, when hundreds of defenceless civilians were shot down by Government troops.

The Khilafat Agitation

The mighty drama of the Khilafat agitation was also enacted during these fateful days. After the surrender of Germany, the Allies decided to cut up the Turkish territory and distribute it among themselves. The Sultan of Turkey was the Caliph of Islam, and the Indian Muslims were profoundly perturbed over the prospect of the annihilation of Turkey and the enslavement of the Islamic countries. The Congress under the leadership of Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru was in sympathy with the Muslims when they set up the All-India Khilafat Conference and launched an agitation campaign in support of the Khilafat (Caliphate of the Sultan of Turkey). Maulana

Muhammad Ali and his brother, Maulana Shauket Ali, espoused the cause of the Khilafat and the Indian Muslims followed them with an enthusiasm for which no parallel exists in the Indian History of the present Century. In January, 1920 a deputation of Muslims waited on the Viceroy and expressed their anxiety to see the Turkish Empire saved from dismemberment and the sovereignty of the Sultan as Caliph maintained.

In the meanwhile the proposed terms of peace with Turkey were published. The worst fears of the Muslims were realized. The great Turkish Empire was to be broken up and divided among the Allies. Even the Greeks, who had been for hundreds of years under Turkish Rule, were to be established in the Turkish homelands as masters of the Turks.

Muslim India made up its mind to join the Non-co-operation Movement of Mr. Gandhi. Government institutions including law courts, schools and colleges, offices, etc. were to be boycotted. The 19th March, 1920 was fixed as the day for national mourning. As the movement gathered impetus, people were asked to give up titles and government honours; government officials were asked to resign and the public were told to stop paying taxes. The aim of the movement according to Mr. Gandhi was the attainment of Swaraj and preservation of the Khilafat. A great deal of disorder in the country was created. Mr. Gandhi became the foremost leader of the Congress and the most popular man in India. The Ali Brothers, who were the leaders of the Muslims, closely followed Mr. Gandhi's policy.

A remarkable outcome of the profound discontent among the Muslims was the *Hijrat* movement. The leaders of the movement, who were mostly mullas, told the people that India had become unsafe for Islam and that it did not become true Muslims to live under the rule of the British who had been participants in the oppression of the Caliphate. So thousands of Muslims—men, women and children—left their homes and hearths and started on their way to the neighbouring Muslim state of Afghanistan. Hundreds perished on the way. There was obviously no room for all the emigrants in Afghanistan, so the Afghan Government was compelled to forbid their entry into the country. There was great loss of life and property, while the extent of suffering endured by these brave people can scarcely be estimated.

While the non-cooperation movement was so fervently embraced by a section of the Indian people, it failed to touch the masses. The Government jails were full and the machinery of administration was greatly strained, but at no stage did the Government make a false move. The Hindus and Muslims were outwardly united, but the two communities were acutely aware of the differences in their aims and ideals. The Hindus had little sympathy with the Pan-Islamic sentiments that stirred the Muslims even more than their own immediate interests. The fiery Ali brothers asserted again and again that they were "Muslims first and everything afterwards." The Congress under the leadership of Mr. Gandhi lent official support to the Khilafat movement and the Hindu masses fell back on the

Hindu Mahasabha whose aims and ideals were the expression of Hindu nationalism. The Hindus in the Congress itself were more or less disinterested spectators of the Muslim rage and fury over the Khilafat. The non-cooperation phase which had brought the two nations on a common platform could not last very long, and the divergence of ways was bound to come.

At this juncture came the Moplah Rebellion. The Moplahs, Muslims of mixed Arab and Indian descent who had settled on the Malabar coast in the past, were profoundly affected by the spirit of the times; and, not appreciating the niceties of the creed of non-violence, paralyzed the local administration by raising an armed revolt. Being acutely religion-conscious, they soon fell out with the local Hindus and a great deal of bloodshed occurred. The Moplah were put down with extrême severity—an example of the Government action being the wagon episode in which out of a hundred Moplahs shut up in a goods wagon seventy died of suffocation. Greatly exaggerated accounts of Moplahs' maltreatment of Hindus in the press were the cause of much ill-feeling between the communities.

The Hindus had been unable to keep pace with the Muslims in direct action in non-cooperation, and with the change in the European situation the movement fizzled out. In August 1922 the Turks, under Mustafa Kamal Pasha, defeated the Greeks and drove them out of Anatolia and European Turkey. There was tremendous rejoicing over the Turkish triumph among the Indian Muslims. The sufferers in the Khilafat agitation felt that their efforts

had not been in vain. The last outpost of Islam in Europe had been saved

Divergence of Ways

The year 1923 saw the death of the non-cooperation movement. It also saw the rise of the aggressive and violent brand of Hindu nationalism. The Congress, because of its association with the Muslims in the hectic days of the Khilafat agitation, lost adherents among the Hindus After 1923 the Hindu Mahasabha, which stood for militant Hinduism, gained great strength under the leadership of men like Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya

On the other hand, the collapse of the Khilafat movement left the Muslims without a political programme. There were divisions in the League ranks and Muslim leaders—aware that Hindu-Muslim unity was fast crumbling and antagonism rising between the two nations—kept running about attending conferences for communal harmony. Unity was however made impossible by the action of the Hindu Mahasabha which espoused an extensive programme of direct attack on the national being of the Muslims. Congress leaders were unable—owing to perhaps to their being Hindus after all—to stem the rising tide of Hindu aggression. A few great men like the late Mr. C.R. Das made earnest attempts to bring about a Hindu-Muslim understanding but earned unpopularity among the lesser Hindu leaders, and the short-sighted masses accused them of unduly favouring the Muslim cause. The Hindu-Muslim relations worsened till the breaking point was reached and severe rioting broke out all

over the country. Violence and bloodshed completed what short-sighted leadership had begun.

The Hindus started "Sanghatan" and "Shuddhi" movements, to which the Muslims replied with "Tanzeem" and "Tableegh" organizations The two communities started a race in efforts for organised internal unity and proselytization. Living close together in towns and villages, the Hindus and Muslims could not but clash in persuance of these activities, particularly as the organizations of each were intended to ward off real or imaginary danger from the other. It is significant that while the most eminent leaders in the Congress and the League desired to end this state of affairs and wanted to establish unity among the Indian peoples, men like Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya were exhorting one section of the people to take up arms against the other. The Hindu Mahasabha, under the presidentship of Mr. Malviya, openly avowed their aim to be the establishment of Hindu Raj and the subjection of the 90 million Muslims who had ruled the subcontinent with the sword for a thousand years. What the Mahasabhite leaders wanted the Hindus to think and feel was summed up by Mr. Hardayal in a statement he issued in a Mahasabhite daily in 1925:

"I declare that the future of the Hindu race of Hindustan and of the Punjab rests on these pillars (1) Hindu Sanghatan (2) Hindu Raj (3) Shuddhi of Muslims and (4) Conquest and Shuddhi of Afghanistan and the frontiers. So long as the Hindu nation does not accomplish these four things the safety of our children and great-grand

children will be ever in danger and the safety of the Hindu race would be impossible. The Hindu race has but one history and its institutions are homogeneous. But the Mussalmans and the Christians are far removed from the confines of Hinduism, for their religions are aliens and they love Persian, Arab and European institutions. Thus just as one removes the foreign matter from the eye, Shuddhi must be made of these two religions."

Mr. Hardayal while thus speaking had apparently forgotten the centuries of Muslim rule and the Third Battle of Panipat when Hindudom had brought destruction upon itself by similar impertinences. These and similar utterances caused bloody riots all over the country. In his *Thoughts on Pakistan*, Dr. Ambedkar most unjustly blames the Muslims for being more violent than the Hindus, while in actual fact the Muslims suffered as much, if not more, in the course of the bloody street-fighting that broke out in every large town in India.

The various efforts at unity proved unsuccessful. The Congress drew further and further away from the Muslims and drew closer to the Hindu Mahasabha. In fact the membership of the Congress and the Mahasabha was fluid, and thousands of Hindus were members of both. A show of unity in the Congress was maintained by passing some resolutions stressing the need for inter-communal cooperation, but the rank and file took their cue from the bellicose utterances of the Mahasabha leaders

As a prelude to constitutional reform a statutory Commission led by Sir John Simon visited India in February,

1928 Indian opinion disapproved of no Indian being appointed on the Commission, and a movement was set afoot to boycott it. In the meanwhile the Congress adopted a resolution to the effect that the executive should convene an All Parties Conference and prepare a constitution for India which should be acceptable to all parties. At the same session complete independence was declared to be the goal of India.

The Muslim League under the leadership of Mr. Jinnah agreed with the Congress in boycotting the Simon Commission. The Punjab Muslim League, however, defied the authority of the Central body and under the leadership of Sir Muhammad Shafi evinced its willingness to cooperate with the Commission.

The All-Parties conference met on the 12th February, 1928 and proposed that the contemplated constitution for India should be framed with the object of attaining for the country the political status of the Dominions in the British Empire.

The Council of the Muslim League disapproved the suggestions of the All-Parties Conference, and directed the League representatives to demand a recognition from all parties of the aims and ideals set forth by the Muslim League in its Calcutta Session of 1927, failing which the Council resolved to withdraw from the All-Parties Conference.

Following this divergence of opinion, the Conference decided to ask a Committee, presided over by Pandit Moti Lal Nehru, to frame a constitution. The deliberations of the

committee later appeared as the Nehru Report which evoked strong opposition from the minorities The Report recommended that separate electorates be completely discarded and the principle of joint electorate be introduced in all representative bodies. Reservation of seats as a temporary means was to be introduced but separate electorates, being in the words of the Report, "harmful to the development of Muslims themselves on national lines", was to be done away with.

A strong section of the Muslims, notably the Punjabis under the leadership of Sir Muhammad Shafi were wholly for separate electorates, while others were in agreement with the principle of joint electorate as formulated in the Nehru Report. A considerable number held no definite views on the issue, but were mildly mistrustful of the Hindu Congressmen. At this juncture, the Hindu Mahasabha adopted an attitude which indicated which way the wind blew and helped to unite the Muslims on the League platform. The Mahasabhite delegates declared that if a single word in the Nehru Report in respect of the Communal Settlement was changed, they would immediately boycott the Conference.

The Muslims felt a great need for unity among themselves, but were torn into factions. Mr. Jinnah put forward his famous Fourteen Points outlining the safeguards necessary for the protection of the Muslim interests. Among other things he demanded that in the Central Legislature the Muslim representation must not be less than one-third, and that representation of communal groups should conti-

nue to be by means of separate electorates as was the existing practice; all cabinets should be at least a third part Muslim; and "the constitution should embody adequate safeguards for the protection of Muslim culture and for the protection and promotion of Muslim education, language, religion, personal laws, and Muslim charitable institutions and for their due share in the grants-in-aid given by the state and by local self-governing bodies." The Muslims had apparently no illusions about the use of power by Hindus in a democratically governed country, and they were bent upon the provision of real and irrepudiable safeguards for their interests.

The dissatisfaction of the minorities with the Nehru Report resulted in the Report being allowed to lapse at the Lahore session of the Congress, but no positive efforts were made to meet the demands of the Muslims. On the other hand, the Muslims were reviled as communalists opposed to national unity. The Hindu press took up the attitude of outraged patriotism towards Muslims who had lost faith in the Congress. Mutual suspicion, distrust and hatred grew between the two peoples, and hopes of a settlement became fainter.

The year 1930 saw the publication of the Simon Report and the meeting of the Round Table Conference in London. The various Indian representatives stressed the need for constitutional reform and even the representatives of the Princes did not lag behind in advocating the cause of political progress. The Muslims, while demanding complete self-government, also desired that safeguards for

the minorities be embodied in the constitution itself.

Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal's Presidential Address

It was against this background of political turmoil that the Allahabad Session of All-India Muslim League was held in 1930, and the poet, Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal, was invited to preside over it. In his Presidential address the poet-philosopher for the first time pointed out in unmistakable terms the necessity of dividing the Indian subcontinent into Hindu and Muslim spheres. His discourse remains one of the very few truly Islamic interpretations of the theory of nationalism. He pointed out that the separation of the church and the state which was the outcome of the rise of nationalism in Europe could not be envisaged for an Islamic state. He said, "If you begin with the conception of religion as complete other-worldliness then what has happened to Christianity in Europe is perfectly natural. The universal ethics of Jesus is displaced by national systems of ethics and polity. The conclusion to which Europe is consequently driven is that religion is a private affair of the individual and has nothing to do with what is called man's temporal life. Islam does not bifurcate the unity of man into an irreconcilable duality of spirit and matter. In Islam God and the universe, spirit and matter, church and state, are organic to each other . . .

"Is religion a private affair? Would you like to see Islam, as a moral and political ideal meeting the same fate in the world of Islam as Christianity has already met in Europe? Is it possible to retain Islam as an ethical ideal and to reject it as a polity in favour of national polities, in

which religious attitude is not permitted to play any part?" Thus Iqbal voiced the point of view which millions of Indian Muslims felt was in their inmost thoughts. It was to form a Muslim homeland with a government constituted on Islamic lines that he subsequently suggested the separation of regions with a Muslim majority from Hindu India. He said, "India is Asia in miniature. Part of her people have cultural affinities with nations in the east and part with nations in the middle and west of Asia. If an effective principle of cooperation is discovered in India, it will bring peace and mutual goodwill to this ancient land which has suffered so long, more because of her situation in historic space than because of any inherent incapacity of her people. And it will at the same time solve the entire problem of Asia.

"It is however painful to observe that our attempts to discover such a principle of internal harmony have so far failed.... And as far as I have been able to read the Muslim mind, I have no hesitation in declaring that, if the principle that the Indian Muslim is entitled to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian home-lands is recognized as a basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India. The principle, that each group is entitled to free development on its own lines is not inspired by any feeling of narrow communalism. There are communalisms and communalisms... I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religions and social institutions of other communities. Nay it is my duty,

according to the teaching of the Quran even to defend their places of worship if need be. Yet I love the communal group which is the source of my life and behaviour; and which has formed me what I am by giving me its religion, its literature, its thought, its culture, and thereby recreating its whole past, as a living operative factor, in my present consciousness . . .

"India is a continent of human groups belonging to different races, speaking different languages and professing different religions. Their behaviour is not at all determined by a common race-consciousness. Even the Hindus do not form a homogeneous group. The Muslim demand for the creation of a Muslim India within India is, therefore, perfectly justified . . .

"I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-Government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslims state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-Western India... The idea need not alarm the Hindus or the British. India is the greatest Muslim country in the world. The life of Islam as a cultural force in the country very largely depends on its centralisation in a specified territory. This centralisation of the most living portion of the Muslims of India, whose military and police service has notwithstanding unfair treatment from the British, made the British rule possible in this country, will eventally solve the problem of India as well as of Asia."

Iqbal anticipated the opposition that a separationist scheme would meet from the non-Muslims. What the Hindus fear most today is that an autonomous Pakistan would conquer the rest of India. The Hindus are scared of the Western Punjabies and Pathans, and would like nothing better than that the total resources of the Indian sub-continent were expended upon keeping them down. The non-violence propaganda of the Congress is intended to emasculate the martial Muslims, and would have done considerable harm but that the explicit tenets of Islam left no room for hypocrisy or metaphysical perversion. Iqbal pointed out that the interests of the Hindus would be safest in a strictly Islamic state. The Islamic form of Government did not interfere in any way with the non-Muslim citizens who were free to practice their own religion and customs as they chose.

"Nor should the Hindus fear that the creation of autonomous Muslim states will mean the introduction of a kind of religious rule in such states. . . . The character of a Muslim state can be judged from what the Times of India pointed out some time ago in a leader on the Indian Banking Inquiry Committee. In ancient India the paper points out, "the state framed laws regulating the rates of interest; but in Muslim times, although Islam clearly forbids the realization of Interest on money loaned, Indian Muslim States imposed no restrictions on such rates. I therefore demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim state in the best interests of India and Islam."

The Communal Award

The Communal Award granting separate electorates to the Muslims and other minorities was published in 1932. Mr. Gandhi threatened to fast unto death if the grant of separate electorates to the Depressed Classes was not abolished. The statement issued by a joint assembly of the Muslim League, the Muslim Conference and the Jamiat-ul-Ulema contained the following sentences:

"The communal decision given by His Majesty's Government last August was only necessary because of the regrettable failure of the communities despite the most strenuous and repreated endeavours over a period of many years to reach an agreement regarding their respective political positions in the self-governing India. In our view this failure was due to the persistent refusal of the majority community to meet the minorities' just and reasonable claims. Owing to the complete deadlock thus created, a position arose in which, had no award on the subject been given by His Majesty's Government, it would have been impossible for India to progress any further towards the management of her own affairs."

The Congress and the Muslim League tried to come to an agreement over the Communal Award issue but failed; while Messrs. Malviya and Chintamani organised the Anti-Communal Award movement and succeeded in antagonising even the most moderate elements among the Muslims. Street-fighting between Hindus and Muslims broke out in several towns in the Punjab and resulted in great loss of life and property.

CONGRESS 'NATIONALISM'

The Government of India Act, 1935

The White Paper and the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report preluded the Government of India Act of 1935. The Congress opposed the Act unreservedly, while the Muslim League decided to give a trial to the reforms. Mr. Jinnah formed a Central Election Board, with branches in the provinces, to contest the elections.

The Congress met in Lucknow and completely rejected the Reforms. A demand for a constituent assembly was put forward, but shortly afterwards the Congress leaders changed their mind and decided to accept office—not to work the Reforms but to wreck them from within. The formation of the Muslim League Parliamentary Board was criticized in the Congress and Mahasabha circles. The Congressites wanted that the League should merge its identity in the Congress and should cease to function as a political body. The Muslims were called agents of imperialism, traitors and reactionaries, but the Muslim Leage did not trust the promises or fear the rebukes of the Congress. They went forward with their election propaganda and won a large number of seats in every legislature. Subsequent events were to show the wisdom of their course.

The Congress captured practically every Hindu seat in the legislatures and was entrenched in a strong position. Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru declared that "only in regard to the Muslim seats did we lack success" and proposed that

"mass contact" with the Muslims be established. The Viceroy Lord Linlithgow assured Mr. Gandhi that the special powers vested in the Governors to interfere in the Provincial Legislation and administration, would, practically speaking, be never exercised. This meant that the Muslims were placed completely at the mercy of the Hindus where the latter were in a majority. How cruelly the Hindu Congressites were to use their newly-acquired power to oppress the Muslims in the process of "nationalizing" them was not realized at this stage either by the British or the Muslims.

From the very start the Congress refused to recognize the existence of the Muslim League. In the Hindu majority provinces they could well afford to do so, as, under the constitution, all they needed to obtain political power, was a numerical majority. Actually, as Mr. Muhammad Noman points out, "the Congress had not won a single Muslim seat in any province except perhaps one or two seats in the Punjab and Bihar but contrary to all notions of equity and fairplay, it chose to ignore the existence of Muslims as a political entity and decided to ride roughshod over them by sheer force of number." The Congress President said that the Congress and the Government were the only two parties in the country. To break the solidarity of the Muslims the mass-contact movement was launched. As Mr. Muhammad Noman says, "Unconditional surrender, signing of the Congress pledges, liquidation of the Muslim League Party, in other words complete extinction of political existence was demanded of the Mussal-

mans." The separate electorates had guaranteed to the Muslim minorities a certain number of seats. While the Muslim members formed Muslim League Party blocks and refused to have their political identity obliterated, individual renegades were bribed with ministerships and made to sign the Congress pledges.

The Congress in Power

Now began a regime which woke up the scattered Muslim millions of India from their sleep of a century. The world saw in objective fact the realization of the fears which the Muslims had voiced, in season and out of season, of the rule of a Hindu majority. Apart from constitutional dishonesty, the Hindus used the power that their being in a majority gave them to organize oppression and terrorisation of the Muslims. The "mass-contact movement", as it was called, aimed at the total extinction of Muslims as Muslims. The Hindus launched an organized attack aided by the machinery of a powerful beaurocracy and ultimately supported by British bayonets, on the culture, religion, prosperity and in some cases on the very lives and honour of the Mussalmans. The scheme was augmented with the Vidya Mandir educational plan which spelt abolition of Urdu, weeding out words of Arabic and Persian origin from Hindi, revival of the dead Pali and Prakrit, giddy circulars and orders to schools enjoining the idolatorous worship of Mr. Gandhi's images and singing of the Bande Matram so obnoxious and revolting to Muslim sentiments, forcing Muslim school children to discard the merest token of their culture and religion like greetings, gross abuse of

Muslim emperors and kings in books of History, refusal of grants-in-aid to Muslim institutions and a general attempt at destroying the consciousness of their religion and culture from the minds of Muslim children.[1]

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the sponsor of the "mass-contact" movement appeared for the first time as a Hindu partisan of the first rank. Because of his western education and his contacts in England Pandit Nehru had succeeded in appearing as a catholic-minded patriot—a citizen of the world who had devoted his life to the cause of freedom—to well-meaning, credulous outsiders like Lord Huntingdon.

[1] The Report of the Muslim League Enquiry Committee presided over by Raja Syed Muhammad Mahdi of Pirpur, after citing the support of eminent Hindus like Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru for the contention that Urdu is the *lingua franca* of India says: "Complaints were also made to us of the unwillingness of Government and local bodies to open Urdu schools where the number of Muslim boys of school-going age justified the existence of such schools. In Malabar, of the 73 schools declared uneconomic by the Standing Committee of the District Board and recommended for abolition 58 are Moplah Muslim schools. Moreover most of the special facilities provided to the Moplahs by the previous government to encourage education among them have been withdrawn by the Congress Government. Then Districts like Sangor and Mandla in C.P. with a substantial Muslim population have no Urdu school . . . Applications written in Urdu are rejected by the municipal boards in in the Central Provinces and Berar. Then the books prescribed at present for study deal exclusively with the glories of Hindu divinities and Hindu Heroes and saints; and contain no reference to the cultural and social achievements of the Muslims or to any historic names held in veneration by them. The grievance of the Muslims is not that these text books deal with Hindu heroes and Hindu great men, but that they do not speak of the Muslims at all. This is not a way to evolve a single nationality or build up a common culture."

But the terrible organized persecution turned on the Muslims has disillusioned millions in this country and abroad about the altruism of the seemingly broad-minded Hindu leaders of the Congress. The Hindu belief that cows are holy and are to be worshipped led to hundreds of organized attacks upon the life and property of Muslims who kill the animal for food. In fact the prevention of cow-killing was made a pretext for mass-terrorization of Muslims. Houses were looted, crops were burnt and lives were taken in the attacks on the numerically weak Muslim populations.

These attempts on Muslim life and property would not have been so frequent and would not have caused so much distress had the rioters known that the machinery of law and order would be equitable and just in its operations. The Hindu masses believed and were encouraged in the belief that the rule of the Congress was the rule of the Hindus, and the time was come to oppress and swallow every one who was not a Hindu. The officers of the administration had been instructed by the Congress ministries to act in consultation with the local Congressmen, with the result that gross corruption and injustice crept into the functioning of the Government. Whenever the Hindu mobs terrorized the Muslims, the administration took no notice of the injustices and outrages committed on the Muslims. The Hindu officials hushed up cases of gross inhumanities perpetrated upon Muslim children, women and old men by dastardly hooligans, or when the outrages were committed on a large scale the Hindu officials arranged " com-

promises" which enabled the cowardly criminals, who in the strength of numbers looted and murdered the scattered and defenceless Muslims, to go scot-free. The powerful Hindu press carried out a lying propaganda calculated to show up the Muslims as avaracious and ferocious enemies of peace who took every opportunity to oppress their meek and gentle Hindu neighbours.

Hundreds of dreadful deeds were perpetrated by the Hindu "nationalists" who knew that if they were worsened they would obtain the support of the Government which would call up the armed Hindus in the police. It was impossible for the most oppressed Muslim to gain redress, for the total machinery of the Government from the constables upwards was under Hindu control. Yet in some instances, where tne cases came up to the higher courts, the unashamed unscrupulousness of the Hindu officials was exposed by independent and impartial judges. In a case against a Congress M.L A. which came before the Allahabad High Court the judges observed:

"We have reason to believe that a large number of communications have been addressed to courts in this Province during the last month by persons on behalf of parties to cases and others interested in such cases . . . It must be made clear to everyone that this court will not tolerate any attempt to bring pressure upon a judicial officer and particularly upon junior judicial officers who are not in a position to defend themselves." The above extract from the judgement of the Allahabad High Court is quoted in the Report of the Pirpur League Inquiry Committee.

Commenting upon the incident the Committee say: "We have received numerous complaints, supported by evidence, from Muslims that they have been bullied by local Congress organisations and have found it difficult to get even-handed justice . . . The atmosphere is no longer congenial to the pursuit of ordinary vocations of life with freedom.

"In spite of all this prominent Congress leaders lose no opportunity of repeating that one of the first acts of the Congress Cabinets was to restore the civil liberty of the people. We should like to know if this civil liberty is only meant for members of the majority community."

The worst of such cases—perhaps the worst in the annals of democratic government—was the now famous Biswa Murder Case. In the village of Chandur Biswa in Berar, rioting broke out and a Hindu was killed. The Congress Government wreaked vengeance upon the total Muslim population by such inhuman and unscrupulous methods that when the case went up to the High Court the total Congress administration from the Premier down to the perjured witnesses of the Crown were censured in terms which showed that scarcely any government can have been so meanly unprincipled as the Congress Government of the C.P. and Berar. An adjournment motion had been moved in the Assembly and, in the words of the High Court Judgement, "in the course of the resumed debate a number of members thought fit to speak as though it was known with precision what crime had been committed and so far as one member was concerned indication was given as to who had committed the murder. In the

course of that debate the then Prime minister himself did not hesitate to use the word 'murder' and to indicate that this was not a case of riot but a carefully planned murder ruthlessly carried out."

The Chief Justice further remarked, "This is a distressing case. The epithet is justified when we see in this case where forty-three men are standing on their trial on a capital charge, witness after witness whose evidence is false, improved and tutored, going into the box. So far as seven of these witnesses are concerned, they are children or young people who have been coached to give false evidence. False evidence in such a case means that the witness or the coach is doing his best to get another human being hanged careless of whether he is innocent or not. Human conduct can hardly stoop to anything lower than endeavouring to kill one's enemies through the lips of prejured children." Summing up the reasons for the concoction of the case the judgement goes on to say, "The concoction is transparent and so is the reason. Ikrammuddin was the leader of the Muslims and therefore, the five most important witnesses in the case come forward and concoct a deliberately false story in order to swear away the leader's life . . . All these fantastic stories would be comic if it was not for the tragedy of it. The conspiracy has resulted in six men being sentenced to death and twenty-four to transportation for life. . . . The case has been treated as some gruesome festival in which witness has vied with witness to see how many Muslims he could be instrumental in sending to the gallows. Truth, honour, respect for human life, regard for one's

sworn word have all been thrown to the winds . . . When attempts are made to tamper with evidence and to deflect the normal course of justice by such outrageous investigation as we had in this case, such results are perhaps inevitable . . . We find a deep laid concert on the part of those witnesses to bring in every Mohammadan they possibly can, just because he is a Mohammadan."

This is just stunning. After this if any one can pretend that Muslims can have the same aims and ideals or can evolve a common national being with the Hindus, he would be actuated by something worse than mere folly or ignorance. It is difficult to imagine worse oppression than that the Government of a province almost as big as Italy should be so incredibly mean that they should plot against the lives of individuals in a manner so cowardly and unscrupulous. It must be stated here that the Biswa murder conspiracy was not an isolated case. For one case that chanced to come under the searchlight of justice, there must have been hundreds, nay thousands other that did not come upto the High Court and in which the spirit of cowardly cruelty must have worked to cause immeasurable misery to the poor, unfortunate Muslims whom fate had cast amidst the Hindu majority. The Biswa murder case was not the result of the malevolence of an individual or a small group. The whole administration down from the Premier to the police constables and the entire Hindu population of the village collaborated in this "gruesome festival." This was not an exceptional case. The tragedy was the outcome of the spirit that is working in the entire fabric of organized

Hindu politics.

The lower court had, in the Biswa murder case, sentenced six men to death and twenty-four to transportation for life. Had the means of an appeal to the High Court been lacking the whole tragedy would have been consummated in silence. The poor innocent Muslims would have been executed and deported without the world knowing the reality of the case. No one would have believed the poor Muslim peasants' stories of oppression, and the huge Hindu press would have accused the espousers of the Muslims' cause as 'rank communalists; 'traitors to the country,' 'enemies of nationalism', 'agents of the imperial power, and used other violent epithets at which the saintly Mr. Gandhi would have shaken his head and prayed to God to dispel the intransigence of "Muslim brethren". But, when the strictures of the High Court on the Congress Government were published, Mr. Gandhi the *mahatma*, the Great Soul, said nothing in condemnation of the outrage. Mr. A.K. Fazlul Haq of Bengal on this occasion wrote an 'open letter' to Mr. Gandhi in which he cited extracts from the judgement of the Allahabad High Court and said:

"That is the way that men brought to power by the much-vaunted Congress behaved towards Muslim minorities in the name of democracy. That is the way that justice was meted out to the Muslim minority.

"And yet you talk of democracy and justice and accuse Britain for not having yielded to the Congress demand which would enable the Congress to give for ever such displays of democracy and such displays of justice.

"You may say that this is but an isolated case. Scores of examples can be cited to show how the same mentality was at work and caused incalculable suffering and even loss of life, limb and property, to the Muslim minorities in the several other provinces where the Congress was in power.

"In the second place has a single Hindu anywhere in the whole of India expressed his abhorrence at the conduct of those who thus conspired to send innocent Muslims to the gallows? Has a single Hindu news-paper expressed sympathy with the Muslims whom justice has rescued from the jaws of death or condemned the Hindus who conspired to send these innocent men to the gallows? . . .

"And, Mahatmaji, what have you yourself done about it? You could not have been ignorant of these facts. Was not your sense of truth, your sense of non-violence, your sense of justice, your sense of righteousness, outraged by the despicable conduct of some of these men belonging to the Congress and belonging to your community? You found the trivial affairs of the small district of Noakhali in the province of Bengal sufficiently important to elicit from you an article in Harijan with clear directions to Hindus to use violence against their alleged opponents. In fact nothing at all was or is wrong with Noakhali except that just one Muslim had once delivered just one indiscreet speech.

"But the tragedy of Chandur Biswa, the tragedy of the mean conspiracy by Hindus against the lives of innocent Muslims has left you unmoved. Not a word has

dropped from your lips and not a word has flowed from your pen to indicate that you condemn the conduct of the Hindus who vied with one another, 'in a gruesome festival' of lies with the sole aim of swearing away Muslim lives. How are we to interpret your silence?

"Do not these facts conclusively prove that Hindus and Muslims are two different peoples, that democracy in the sense of pure and simple majority rule cannot be accepted by Muslims and justice cannot be expected from Hindus in power towards the Muslims?...

"In the circumstances if the Muslims believe that possessing the mentality which they do and which has been revealed in connection with the occurrence at Chandur Biswa, Hindus, if they secure the power of domination, cannot and will not render even the most elementary justice to the Muslims—can you honestly maintain that this belief is unjustified?"

The Congress policy of trying to establish Hindu Raj and making the Hindus feel that they must assert their importance as the majority community by trampling upon the Muslim minority caused an unprecedented number of bloody riots in every province where Congress was in power. The breakdown of peace provided the Congress Government further opportunities of inspiring the Hindu masses with the consciousness of their being the ruling race by inflicting terrible privations upon the Muslims under the excuse of doing justice. The frightfulness of Congress atrocities went so far that the All-India Muslim League appointed a number of Inquiry Committees to report on

the Muslim grievances. Their findings were later published by the Muslim League and the last poor shreds of the pretence of the Congress being a representative body of both Hindus and Muslims were destroyed for ever.

The attitude of the Muslims towards the British during the Congress terms of office was summed up in the League Council's resolution of 27th August, 1939 which reads thus:

"This Council while deploring the policy of the British Government towards Muslims in India, in attempting to force upon them against their will the constitution, in particular the Federal Scheme, as embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, which allows a prominent hostile and communal majority to trample upon their religious, political, social and economic rights and expressing regret at the utter neglect and indifference shown by the officers and Governors of the Congress-governed provinces in exercising their special powers to protect and secure justice to the minorities, and the British Government's attitude towards Arabs in Palestine in refusing to meet the latters' demands, holds the view that in these circumstances, if the British Government desires to enlist the support and sympathy of the Muslims of the world, particularly Indian Muslims, in future contingencies, it must meet the demands of Muslim India without delay."

The Second Great War and the End of Congress Rule

Meanwhile the international situation had been steadily worsening in Europe. In September, 1939 Great Britain declared war on Germany and the Viceroy declared India

to be in a state of war against the enemies of Britain.

The Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, addressed the legislature and announced that in view of the war situation the introduction of constitutional reforms at the Federal Centre must be postponed, and that the country should concentrate its efforts on the prosecution of the war.

At this juncture the Congress demanded that political reform in India should be expedited so that the country might make the completest effort to win the war. Writing on the political situation in India the *Times* of London wrote, "They (the Congress leaders) evidently hope to extract political profit from the situation by inducing the British Government to make further constitutional concessions in the shape of modifications of reforms."

The Viceroy invited Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Gandhi a number of times in the hope of coming to a decision with them in order to be able to invite unreserved cooperation from the country, but Mr. Gandhi would not even admit that the Muslim League was on the whole the representative body of the Indian Muslims. Other obvious demands such as the appointment as ministers of those Muslims who possessed the confidence of the Muslim members of the legislatures were not found acceptable by the Congress leaders.

The British Government, however, went no further than declaring that Dominion Status was the goal that they envisaged for India after the war. As a protest against the British proposal to concede their demands the Congress Governments in the provinces resigned office in December, 1939.

Muslim India experienced indescribable relief at being freed from Congress tyranny. The 22nd of December was observed as the Day of Deliverance and Thanksgiving by Muslims all over India. Other minority communities who had suffered under Congress Raj shared this feeling and the Parsi community of Bombay joined the Muslims in observance of the Day of Deliverance.

The Congress now started bargaining with the British Government over the price of cooperation. Mr. Jinnah, the President of the Muslim League warned the British Government that if any bargain was struck with the Congress over the heads of the Muslims, the country would be plunged in disorder. Lord Linlithgow assured the Muslims that no step would be taken without consultation of all parties and the Congress began to contemplate launching a Civil Disobedience Movement. It was the Government now who acted first. Before the movement could be organized, all prominent Congressites were arrested and put in jail.

"PAKISTAN"

The League Demands Separation

In February, 1940, the All-India Muslim League met in Lahore. In his address Mr. Jinnah said:

"Notwithstanding a thousand years of close contact, nationalities which are as divergent today as ever cannot at any time be expected to transform themselves into one nation merely by means of subjecting them to democratic constitutions and holding them forcibly together by unnatural and artificial methods of British Parliamentary Statutes...

"... This misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise out notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religions, philosophies, social customs, literature. They neither intermarry, nor interdine together and, indeed they belong to two different civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions... To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the Government of such a state."

The famous Pakistan Resolution (quoted in the introduction to this book) was adopted at this session and the whole of Muslim India acclaimed with one voice separate

and complete national self-determination as their goal. A howl of fury went up from Hindu India. Indignant and incoherent abuse of the Muslim League, of Muslim leadership, of Mr. Jinnah, of everything connected with the Muslims poured like a cataract from the huge Hindu press. Responsible Hindu leaders made amazing statements. Some said that the Muslims could not be in earnest, others thought Mr. Jinnah was threatening to separate in order to exact better terms, yet others saw in the Muslim League's resolution a move by the British. Yet the very volume of the opposition indicated to the astute observers that the new demand was neither fantastic nor impossible of realization. In fact it appeared so clearly inevitable that Hindu empire-builders were struck with despair. Even those who cried themselves black and blue in the face that Pakistan was a sheer impossibility knew that nothing could stop it and that nature had set the stage for its realization.

It must not be supposed that the idea of separating the vast regions of the North-Western and Eastern India and constituting them into separate Muslim states was new. As has been already mentioned Sir Muhammad Iqbal had explicitly envisaged the separation of the Islamic North-West and the East as early as 1930. Since that time a Punjabi Mr. Chaudhri Rahmat Ali who had taken up residence at Cambridge had been propagating the idea of separating "Pakistan" from the rest of India. Events of the last several years had been pointing towards separation and Hindu partisans often accused Muslims of wanting to have "Pakistan." But all organized political effort of the

Muslims had, so far, been in the direction of trying to co-operate with the other Indian nations in trying to evolve political unity. With repeated failures in trying to achieve a unity of outlook, and finally having experienced Hindu Raj in the Congress-governed provinces, the Muslims were convinced that their destiny lay apart from other nations of India The espousal of the cause of separation by the Muslim League was to the Muslims like a dream come true. In his *Thoughts on Pakistan* Dr. Ambedkar says :

"The real explanation of the ideological transformation of the Muslim leaders is not to be attributed to any dishonest drift in their opinion. It appears to be the dawn of a new vision pointing to a new destiny symbolized by a new name, Pakistan. The Muslims appear to have started a new worship of a new destiny for the first time. But this is really not so. The worship is new because the sun of their new destiny which was so far hidden in the clouds has now made its appearance in full glow. The magnetism of this new destiny cannot but draw the Muslims towards it... This destiny spreads itself out in a concrete form over the map of India. No one who just looks at the map can miss it. It lies there as though it is deliberately planned by Providence as a separate nation-state for Muslims...

"So obvious is the destiny that it is somewhat surprising that the Muslims should have taken so long to own it up."

With the adoption of complete national self-determination for Muslims in their homelands as the unalterable creed and goal of the All-India Muslim League, the sense

of futility and frustration that had stifled social and political enterprise was removed from the minds of the Muslim masses and intelligentzia. Muslim scholars, political thinkers, jurists, financiers and industrialists could now work for a worthy aim without having to take into account the dormant hostility of their narrow-minded neighbours who, since they had not been a free people for thousands of years, did not know the elementary principles of justice upon which alone can the edifice of freedom be built. They had hitherto been unwelcome neighbours of a hide-bound society which would never merge with them, and in which they found nothing attractive or comforting; now they had been given a name and a home all their own. They were no longer "the Indian Muslim minority." They were now Paks in the shadow of whose swords the millions of Hindustanis had lived for hundreds of years.

The opposition evoked by the Pakistan demand, although of unprecedented intensity, only hardened the Muslims in their resolve. In fact there was little logic or method in the incoherent abuse pouring from the Hindu press and platform, for, apart from the overwhelming force of Muslim sentiment, the demand (as shown in *Pakistan: A Nation*, by El Hamza) is borne out by geographical, historical, climatic, ethnological and economic considerations. Mr. Munshi, ex-Congress leader, organized the Akhand Hindustan movement which was solely intended to oppose the Pakistan demand. The various sections of the Indian Hindus whether in the Congress, the Hindu Mahasabha, the Hindu League, or the Liberal Party, were all opposed

to the Muslim League programme.

However, signs are not lacking of a change of attitude. After the first reaction, which was mainly indignation and vituperation, the saner elements have emerged. It was not possible that the prominent Hindu thinkers should continue to make sentimental talk of "cutting Mother India in two" or "vivisection of the Mother." Several eminent Hindu politicians have tried to make an impartial estimate of the Pakistan proposal, and some of them have come to agree with the basic principle embodied in it. Foremost among them is Mr. C. Rajgopalachariar, famous in India and abroad as one of the master spirits in the Congress and one of the most successful practical politicians in India.

PRESENT DAYS

The C. R. Formula

On April 8, 1944, Mr. C. Rajgopalchariar addressed a letter to Mr. Jinnah in which he offered the basis for a settlement which later became famous as the "C.R. Formula". In the letter "C.R." stated that he had discussed the Formula with Mr. Gandhi who had expressed his approval. "I write this to you on his (Mr. Gandhi's) behalf", wrote Mr. Rajgopalachariar, "and hope that this will bring about a final settlement of the most unfortunate impasse we are in." With his letter Mr. Rajgopalachariar enclosed the Formula which ran as follows:

"Basis for terms of settlement between the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League to which Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah agree and which they will endeavour respectively to get the Congress and the League to approve:

(1) Subject to the terms set out below as regards the constitution for Free India, the Muslim League endorses the Indian Demand for Independence and will co-operate with the Congress in formation of a provisional interim government for the transitional period.

(2) After the termination of the war a commission shall be appointed for demarcating contiguous districts in the North-West and East of India, wherein the

Muslim population is in absolute majority. In the areas thus demarcated a plebiscite of all the inhabitants held on the basis of adult sufferage or other practicable franchise shall ultimately decide on the issue of separation from Hindustan. Such decision shall be given effect to without prejudice to the right of districts on the border to choose to join either state.

(3) It will be open to all parties to advocate their points of view before the plebiscite is held.

(4) In the event of separation mutual agreements shall be entered into for safeguarding defence and commerce and communications and for other essential purposes.

(5) Any transfer of population shall be only on an absolutely voluntary basis.

(6) These terms shall be binding only in case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility for the governance of India."

Mr. Jinnah replied that he was unable to give an answer without consulting the Working Committee of the Muslim League, but Mr. Rajgopalachariar insisted that Mr. Jinnah should give his approval to the formula immediately. Mr. Jinnah was, however, unwilling to take personal responsibility of accepting or rejecting the proposals and repeated his offer to place them before the League Working Committee. Mr. Rajgopalachari thought that no purpose would be served by such procedure and the negotiations ended.

The C.R. Formula evoked a storm of opposition not only

from the Hindu Mahasabha but also from the Congress and the so-called Liberal circles. The scheme was condemned as 'mischievous' and C.R. blamed for trying to "vivisect Mother India." Saner elements however welcomed the move as a starting point for the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem. Dr. Ambedkar welcomed it as 'return to sanity', and thought that the plan provided a basis for further negotiations.

Muslim opinion stoutly supported Mr. Jinnah in not giving his assent to the formula over the heads of the League Working Committee. The Muslim press deplored that C.R. should have so peremptorily demanded a 'yes' or 'no' from Mr. Jinnah. In a statement to the press a member of the Council of the Muslim League said, "Why did Mr. Rajagopalachari assume that it was futile to allow Mr. Jinnah, if he could not himself wholeheartedly back it, to put the proposal before the Muslim League? It is surprising that such an important correspondence, on the result of which the fate of the whole country hung, was brought to an abrupt end. It is worth knowing why so quick a reply was forced out of Mr. Jinnah, without allowing him to discuss it with his colleagues, who, I have no doubt are no less anxious for a fair and just settlement than Mr. Rajagopalchari and Mahatma Gandhi."

Gandhi-Jinnah Talks

The first move to end the deadlock came from Mr. Gandhi who in the middle of July, 1944 wrote to Mr. Jinnah, the President of the All-India Muslim League, expressing the desire that they should meet. "My heart says

that I should write to you " wrote Mr. Gandhi. " Do not regard me the enemy of Islam or of the Muslims of this country."

This apparently frank invitation was readily accepted by Mr. Jinnah, although the pietistic tone affected by Mr. Gandhi aroused some suspicion in Muslim circles. The two leaders met in Bombay on September, 9, and the negotiation for a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim relations began. The talks were documented in a series of letters written by the two leaders to each other.

From the very beginning Mr. Gandhi adopted an attitude which augured ill for a frank and authoritative exchange of views. While Mr. Jinnah spoke on behalf of the Muslims and as President of All-India Muslim League, Mr. Gandhi participated in the negotiations " as an individual ". The situation was unprecedented and Mr. Jinnah was in a delicate position. There is no doubt that the subsequent failure of the talks was largely due to there being no authoritative guarantee for Mr. Gandhi's commitments. No one in Mr. Jinnah's position could afford to weaken the position of the organisation that he represented by risking even a minor change in the stand that he had taken up, for the Congress was not in any way bound to accept any of the concessions that Mr. Gandhi might choose to make in return. There was no constitutional guarantee that the Congress or any other influential organisation would not disown any of Mr. Gandhi's concessions and admissions, for Mr. Gandhi, by his own profession, represented no one but himself. On the other hand if Mr.

Jinnah admitted any change in his standpoint, the political future of the League and the Muslims would be changed accordingly. Thus if Mr. Jinnah conceded any change in the stand he had taken in return for a similar change in Mr. Gandhi's views, it was not impossible that the Congress should have refused to recognise it and Mr. Jinnah would, in that case, permanently weaken the position of the League without gaining anything in return for the nation that he represented.

Mr. Gandhi possesses a unique influence among the Hindu masses but it is by no means certain that all Hindu leaders would meekly follow him; in fact his association with the C.R. Formula which just recognises the existence of the Muslim demands was the cause of his being opposed in no uncertain terms in the Hindu press. The amount of abuse that C.R. drew upon himself from the Hindus for merely evincing an attitude of compromise leaves no room for doubt that the Congress is in no mood for a peaceful settlement.

It was charateristic of Mr. Gandhi's policy that he took a dual stand. His position was unrepresentative and yet representative. Subsequently he could explain his conduct by assuming any of these capacities as the circumstances demanded. If any of his terms suited the Hindus, his voice would be their voice, but if there was something that did not suit them, he could always say (of course in picturesque and pious language) that he was a poor weak individual who saw no light, and that he was communing with his "inner voice," while the Congressmen would

triumphantly point out that he was not even a four anna member of the Congress

In his letter dated September 10, Mr. Jinnah asked Mr. Gandhi for a clarification of the various clauses of the C.R. Formula, as that document had been framed with the consultation and approval of Mr Gandhi. It was expected that Mr Gandhi would further elaborate his conception of how the Muslims would achieve the right of self-determination in peace and with the good will of Hindu India Instead, Mr. Gandhi showed from the very beginning that he intended to confuse the issues raised by the Formula. His replies to Mr. Jinnah's questions were so vague and involved, that instead of clarifying the situation, they distorted the entire picture and robbed the C.R. Formula of the appearance of practicality that it possessed. To Mr. Jinnah's query as to who would frame the "constitution for free India" mentioned in the Formula, and when it would come into being, Mr. Gandhi replied that the constitution would be framed, after the British had withdrawn, by the Provincial Government contemplated in the formula and added the ambiguous sentence, calculated by its phrasing to confuse the idea of separate self-determination for the Muslims that "the independence contemplated is of the whole of India as it stands".

Clause (4) of the formula envisages "mutual agreements" for "safeguarding defence and commerce and communications" in the event of separation. Mr. Jinnah wanted to be informed "through what machinery and agency" would the "mutual agreements" be entered into

and between whom. Mr. Gandhi completely sabotaged the idea of separation (which is the sheet anchor of the Lahore resolution of the League and upon which depends the entire national being of the Indian Muslims) by answering, "'Safeguarding defence' means for me a central or Joint Board of Control," which is no more and no less than a variation of the federal idea so unacceptable to Muslims and so entirely fatal to their interests.

Clause (6) of the Formula says: "These terms shall be binding only in case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility for the Government of India". "I would like to know", wrote Mr. Jinnah, "to whom is this power to be transferred, through what machinery and agency, and when?" Mr. Gandhi's reply was, "The power is to be transferred to the nation, that is to the Provincial Government. The Formula contemplates peaceful transfer by the British Government..." Mr. Gandhi dumped the whole of India—Hindus and Muslims—as 'a nation' thus ignoring the various issues that had led to these talks. To make the formula binding, "transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility" was taken, a shade too casually as a necessary preliminary.

It must have become apparent to Mr. Jinnah at this stage that the 'change of heart' about the Muslims that he had wished for Mr. Gandhi at an earlier stage had not come about, but he proceeded with admirable patience to obtain a fuller expression of Mr. Gandhi's inmost thoughts. Stating his point of view Mr. Jinnah wrote in a subsequent letter, "I urged you that the only solution of India's pro-

blem is to accept the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan, as briefly laid down in the Lahore Resolution of March, 1940 and proceed to settle the details forthwith ... You say the first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is achieving independence by the joint action of all the parties and groups composing India ... This in my opinion is, as I have repeatedly said, putting the cart before the horse, and is generally opposed to the policy and declaration of the All-India Muslim League, and you are only holding on firmly to the August Resolution of 1942."

All recognition of the Muslim rights in the C.R. Formula depends upon the formation of the provisional government. According to Mr. Gandhi the Provisional Government contemplated in the Formula would frame the constitution for 'free India', all power would be transferred by the British to the Provisional Government and the Boundary Commission to demarcate the limits of Pakistan would be appointed by the Provisional Government. Thus the framing of the Provisional Government would be of final importance to the Muslims. Again and again Mr Jinnah asked Mr. Gandhi what the Provisional Government would be, and every time Mr. Gandhi put him off with evasive replies. Mr. Jinnah wrote, "I once more ask you to please let me know what is your conception of the basis for the formation of a Provisional Interim Government. No doubt it will be subject to agreement between the League and the Congress. But, I think in fairness you should at least give me some rough idea or lines of your conception, for you

must have thought it out by now, and I would like to know what are your proposals or scheme for the formation of a Provisional Interim Government, which can give me some clear picture to understand it."

Mr. Gandhi's reply was not only evasive, it was vague and irrelevent to the degree of being exasperating. He wrote, "You ask for my conception of the basis for a Provisional Interim Government I would have told you, if I had any scheme in mind. I imagine that if we two can agree it, would be for us to consult the other parties. I can say this, that any Provisional Government to inspire confidence at the present moment must represent all parties when that moment arrives I shall have been replaced by some authoritative person, though you will have me always at your beck and call when you have converted me or I you, or by mutual conversion we have become one mind functioning two bodies." After this if any one imagined that Mr. Gandhi would try to satisfy Muslims or help in evolving a basis for genuine compromise, he would be optimistic indeed.

In his letter dated September 14, Mr. Jinnah once again stated the absolute necessity of making clear the nature of the Provisional Government. "...I hope that you do appreciate my point when I am requesting you to let me have rough outlines of the proposed Provisional Interim Government according to the formula so that I may have some idea ... I repeat again that, as it is your formula you should give me a rough idea of the Provisional Interim Government that you contemplate and of your concep-

tion. What I would like to know would be, what will be the powers of such a Provisional Interim Government, how will it be formed, to whom it will be responsible, and what will be its composition, etc. You being the sponsor of this Gandhi-C.R. Formula, should give me a rough idea and picture of it, so that I may understand what this start of the Formula means."

Instead of giving a suitable reply to this apparently feeling appeal, Mr. Gandhi shot off at a tangent and exposed himself as a thoroughly partisan Hindu extremist. This was the stage really to get down to business and evolve a basis for the terms of settlement. The merest indication of what the nature of the all-important Interim Government would be, would have been a great step forward and other concrete details would have followed later. But Mr. Gandhi missed the opportunity, and no other construction can be put upon his attitude than that he wanted to avoid any approach to a real compromise. Indeed, he, in a subsequent letter did his best to destroy all ground upon which the possibility of a compromise could rest. In language which the most intractable Mahasabhite extremist could scarcely have improved, he attacked the Muslim nation using terms of contempt which would have ruffled the patience of a lesser man than Jinnah.

With a very un-mahatmic sneer at the 'famous Lahore Resolution' he denied that it made any reference to the two-nations theory. "In the course of your discussions you have passionately pleaded that India contained two nations, i.e. Hindus and Muslims, and that the latter have

their home-lands in India as the former have theirs. The more our argument progresses, the more alarming your picture appears to me. It would be alluring if it was true. But my fear is genuine that it is wholly unreal." Mr. Gandhi further dismissed the Muslim claim tò self-determination by calling them 'a body of converts'. "You seem to have introduced a new test of nationhood," he wrote. "If I accept it I would have to subscribe to many more claims and face an insoluble problem." It is strange that Mr. Gandhi does not realize that, whether he accepts it or not, he would have to face the claims for self-determination of the several nations living in the boundaries of the vast and varied Indian sub-continent. It cannot for a moment be supposed that Mr. Gandhi is not aware of the peculiarities of the Muslims' position. If he insists on denying the unparalleled circumstances of the Muslims' case and persists in regarding them as any other sub-national group in India, he must be completely lacking the realization that a nation of a hundred million, possessing numerical and effective predominance in an area larger than the combined areas of Italy, France, Spain and England, cannot be kept in suppression in a sub-continent which they ruled with the sword for almost a thousand years. If the Muslims win for themselves a home and a name in the Indian sub-continent, it will not be because of men like Mr. Gandhi but inspite of them. They shall never be given their rights: they shall have to take them.

It is amazing that Mr. Gandhi should so completely shut his eyes to the tremendous diversities of race, religion,

climate and mode of life that exist in the vast Indian sub-continent, and should continue to indulge in wishful thinking about a united Pan-Indian state.

Mr. Jinnah, protesting against Mr. Gandhi's refusal to recognize the Muslims as a separate nation, wrote, "We are a nation of a hundred million, and what is more we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilization, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of values and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and cälendar, history and traditions, aptituded and ambitions. In short we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of international law we are a nation."

Mr. Jinnah's repeated demands for the clarification of the C.R. Formula evoked some slight indication of what the Provisional Interim Government would be. In his second letter dated September 15, Mr. Gandhi, with characteristic reluctance to commit himself, wrote, "As to the provisional interim government I am afraid I cannot carry my answer any further than I have done" And then as though he had, in the course of wondering over an ambiguous querry, gussed by inspiration a possible meaning of it, added in the same letter, "Perhaps you want to know how I would form the provisional government if I was invited to form it . . . I can give you full satisfaction about your inquiry 'What I should like to know would be, what will be the powers of such a provisional interim government, how it will be formed, to whom it will be responsible.' The provisional interim government will be respon-

sible to the elected members of the present Assembly or a new elected one It will have all powers minus that of the Commander-in-Chief during the war and full powers thereafter. It will be the authority to give effect to the agreement that may be arrived at between the League and the Congress and ratified by other parties."

This would mean that the body which would make the Constitution, draw the Hindustan-Pakistan boundry, take over power from the British and on the whole hold the fate of the Muslim in its hands would be none other than the present Central Assembly, and that Mr. Jinnah was being asked to hand over complete control of the lives of the Indian Muslims to a central federal body with an overwhelming majority of Hindus! Yet Mr. Gandhi later insisted that his proposal embodied the basic principles of the Lahore Resolution!

Mr. Gandhi refused to concede that the Muslims were a nation. In his letter of September 22, he wrote, "I am unable to accept the proposition that the Muslims of India are a nation distinct from the rest of the inhabitants of India. Mere assertion is no proof. The consequences of accepting such a proposition are dangerous in the extreme. Once the principle is admitted there would be no limits to claims for cutting up India into numerous divisions which would spell India's ruin. . . . I can be no willing party to a division which does not provide for the simultaneous safeguarding of common interests such as defence, foreign affairs and the like.

Mr. Jinnah replied that those subjects which could come

under the heading of common interests could be dealt with by the constitution-making bodies of Pakistan and Hindustan on the footing of their being two independent states. Mr. Gandhi had asserted that the August Resolution of the Congress concerned only the British and that the Muslims were not concerned with it. Mr. Jinnah pointed out that the August Resolution envisaged the setting up of a federal central government on the basis of a united democratic government of India which meant establishment of Hindu "raj". Again the constituent assembly proposed in the Resolution would be a 75% Hindu body. These demands were basically and fundamentally opposed to the ideals and demands of Muslim India. "... If you succeed in realizing this demand," wrote Mr. Jinnah, "it would be a death blow to Muslim India. I see from the correspondence and talks between you and me that you are still holding fast to this fateful resolution." In the same letter Mr. Jinnah stated that he had failed to convert Mr. Gandhi to his point of view.

On September 24, Mr. Gandhi put forward a number of proposals as an alternative to the C.R. Formula. As far as the Muslim demand were concerned the proposals were substantially the same (similar "like the Siamese twins" as Mr. Jinnah subsequently said). "I proceed on the assumption," wrote Mr. Gandhi, "that India is not to be regarded as two or more nations, but as one family consisting of many members of whom the Muslims living in the north-west zone, i.e. Baluchistan, Sindh, the North-West Frontier Province and that part of the Punjab where they

are in absolute majority over all other elements and in parts of Bengal and Assam where they are in absolute majority, desire to live in separation from the rest of India.

"Differing from you in general basis, I can yet recommend to the Congress and the country the acceptance of the claim for separation contained in the Muslim League Resolution of Lahore of 1940 on my basis and on the following terms:

> "The areas should be demarcated by a commission approved by the Congress and the League, the wishes of the inhabitants of the areas demarcated should be ascertained through the votes of the adult population of the areas or some equivalent method.
>
> "If the vote is in favour of a separation it shall be agreed that these areas shall form a separate state as soon as possible after India is free from foreign domination and can, therefore, be constituted into two sovereign independent states.
>
> "There shall be a treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like, which must necessarily continue to be matters of common interest between the contracting parties.
>
> "The treaties shall also contain terms for safeguarding the rights of minorities in the two states.
>
> "Immediately on the acceptance of this agreement by the Congress and the League the two shall de-

cide upon a common course of action for the independence of India.

"The League will however be free to remain out of any direct action to which the Congress may resort and in which the League may not be willing to participate."

Mr. Gandh's offer meant as Mr. Jinnah pointed out that:

(1) Mr. Gandhi did not accept that the Muslims of India are a nation.

(2) He did not recognize the inherent right of self-determination for the Muslims.

(3) He would consider for a plebiscite only those areas in which the Muslims were in an "absolute majority" by which he seemed to indicate areas in which Muslims were about 75% of the total population. The plebiscite would be on the basis of adult sufferage of all communities which would result in the formation of several foreign islands in Pakistan and the mutilation of the natural frontiers of Pakistan.

(4) Pakistan would not be independent in the absolutely vital matters of defence, posts, telegraphs, railways, customs, etc.

(5) Even the mutilated, distorted Pakistan (dependent upon Hindu India in matters of defence, communications, foreign relations, commerce, etc.) would be offered to the Muslims only after the British had withdrawn, which practically

> meant that the question of Pakistan would be shelved for an indefinite period and for all practical purposes Pakistan would receive a decent burial.[1]

At the same time it must not be forgotton that Mr. Gandhi had made this offer while discussing the Pakistan proposal as an 'individual seeker' and *de jure*, represented no one but himself. Thus it is not difficult to understand why Mr. Jinnah later (after the talks had been published and Mr. Gandhi had started his campaign of trying to discredit the League) described Mr. Gandhi's proposals as a veritable trap and slough of death for the Muslims.

The correspondence that followed was marked with growing estrangement and vigorous contradiction on both sides. Mr. Gandhi insisted that his offer contained the essence of the Lahore Resolution, that his not having representative capacity did not matter and that the existing resolutions of the Congress should not be considered. Mr. Jinnah on the other hand was equally adamant that these factors did matter and that Mr. Gandhi had refused to concede the barest essentials of the Muslims' demands. The talks ended at 7-30 P.M. on September, 1944. The

[1] It is interesting to recall here what the English journal *The Spectator* had written in July, 1944 following the publication of Mr. Gandhi's offer to Mr. Jinnah made through Mr. Rajagopalachari. *The Spectator* wrote, "His (Mr. Gandhi's) present proposal is in effect for independence not after the war, but during it, and he knows perfectly well that the British Government would not accept it. That being so the whole of his offer to the Muslim League conveyed to Mr. Jinnah indirectly through Mr. Rajagopalachari rests on thin air..."

effort upon which the eyes of the Indian millions had been fixed in hope and prayer, had failed.

Releasing the correspondence to the press Mr. Jinnah said, "Mr. Gandhi from the very commencement of our talks made it clear that he had approached me in his individual capacity and that he represented no one but himself. However, he assured me that he was really open to conviction and conversion to the Mulim League's Lahore Resolution of March, 1940. Without prejudice to my objection that in order to reach any settlement, negotiations could only be carried on properly when the other side was also fully represented and vested with authority, in deference to Mr. Gandhi's wishes I agreed to the task of persuading and converting him to the fundamentals of the Lahore Resolution.

"I have placed before him everything and every aspect of Muslim points of view in the course of our prolonged talks and correspondence, and we discussed all the pros and cons generally, and I regret to say that I have failed in my task of converting Mr. Gandhi. Nevertheless we hope that the public will not feel embittered and we trust that this is not the final end of our effort."

Mr. Gandhi said that he had done his best to meet Mr. Jinnah's viewpoint, but he had failed. Mr. Rajagopalachariar's formula and Mr. Gandhi's own proposal had failed to satisfy the Qaid-i-Azam and similarly Mr. Jinnah's proposal had failed to commend itself to Mr. Gandhi. If either of them had been weak, they would possibly have come to some sort of agreement, but as responsible men

they could not afford to be weak. Mr. Gandhi appealed to the people of India not to become despondent because he and Mr. Jinnah had failed in converting each other. "Failure should only serve as an incentive to further effort," Mr. Gandhi said.

There was widespread disappointment over the failure of Gandhi-Jinnah talks. "I am grieved on the failure of Gandhi-Jinnah talks," said the Hon'ble Mr. Hasham Gazdar, Home Minister, Sind Government. "It is a misfortune for the Hindus and Muslims alike. The march of events had, after very long time afforded us an opportunity to explore the possibilities of a permanent peace and build our future according to our own design on the basis of mutual understanding and goodwill. But the opportunity is lost. The only hope is that the negotiating parties may again meet each other, as hinted by them." The Muslims were disappointed but there was a feeling in Muslim circles that their case was stronger than ever. Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah had proved himself a politician of the very highest order and had presented the case for his nation in a way that could scarcely have been better. There was no doubt that Mr. Jinnah had exposed the weakness of Mr. Gandhi's stand, and although the Hindu press tried to belittle his achievement by saying that he had merely gained a dialectical advantage over Mr. Gandhi, the fact remained that the essential injustice of Hindu obduracy had been laid bare. Mr. Syed Abdur Rahman did not exaggerate when he said that Mr. Jinnah "ruled the hearts of the hundred million Muslims of India".

SOME PLANS AND PROPOSALS

The diversity of religion, race, language, culture, mode of life and habit of thought in the Indian sub-continent has led a number of scholars and politicians to suggest tentative plans for the political governance of the Indian countries. All these proposals have a common basis in that by statement and implication they clearly point to the impossibility of a unitary government for all the various Indian countries. Some of these plans envisage a complete separation of the Muslim regions from Hindu India, while others offer modifications of the federal plan of the Government of India Act of 1935. The Muslim League has not so far lent official support to any of these schemes, for the policy of the League seems to be avoidance of controversy over matters of detail until the principle of separation embodied in the Lahore Resolution of 1940 is authoritatively recognised by the Hindus and the British. The proposed schemes, though not emanating from representative sources, are yet interesting as speculations regarding the future basis of government of the various nationality conscious peoples of the Indian sub-continent. Some of these schemes are briefly summarised here.

The Confederacy Scheme

"A Punjabi" in his *Confederacy of India* proposes that the Indian sub-continent be divided into a number of regions each of which should be made a federation of the territorial units it comprises. Finally these federations

should be re-assembled in an Indian Confederacy. "A Punjabi" visualises five such Federations.

(1) The Indusstan Federation comprising the Punjab (without the Ambala Division, Kangra District and some portions of the Hoshiarpur District where the Muslims form a minority). The North-West Frontier Province, Kashmir, Sind, Baluchistan, Bahawalpur, Kalat, Las Bela, Kapurthala, Chitral, Swat, Khanpur, and Malerkotla. 'Indusstan' would be 3,98,838 square miles in area and would have a population of about 33,000,000 of which 82 per cent would be Muslims and about 8 per cent Hindus.

(2) The Hindu region federation would comprise the United Provinces, the Central Provinces, Orissa, Bihar, a part of Western Bengal, Assam, Madras, Bombay and the predominantly Hindu states (excluding those that form parts of other federations). This federation would have a population of about 216 million living in an area of about 742,173 square miles. Hindus would be about 83 per cent of the total population and the Muslims 11 per cent.

(3) The Rajistan Federation implies the recognition of the fact that the Rajputs have a distinct national entity of their own. The Rajistan Federation including the Rajput states of Rajputana and Central India would have an area of 180,656, square miles and 17,858,502 population, of which 80 per cent would be Hindus and 8 per cent Muslims.

(4) The Deccan States' Federation would include the Nizam's Dominions and Mysore and Bastur states. The area of this federation would be 125,086 square miles with

a population of about 21 millions of which about 85 per cent would be Hindus and about 9 per cent Muslims.

(5) The Bengal Federation would be the second Muslim Federation and would comprise, East Bengal with some western districts of Assam and some states. The area would be 59,764 square miles with a population of about 31 million, of which about 66 per cent would be Muslims and about 34 per cent Hindus.

The five federations would be reassembled in an Indian Confederacy. The confederal authority would be vested in the Viceroy assisted by a confederal assembly consisting of members drawn from the various Indian Federations. Each federation would have a governor-general who would be entrusted with foreign relations, defence, etc. and would be responsible to the Viceroy. Again each federal unit would have a governor who would be under the Governor-General of the Federation.

"The scheme," the author says, "involves no injustice to any party or any breach of the canons of justice. It promises to restore the balance of communal powers, which is at present too much shaken in favour of the Hindus without being in any way aggressive; to ensure Muslim interests, whether cultural or economic against all dangers at the hands of the said community and to simplify politics on both sides."

Dr. S.A. Latif's Scheme

Dr. Syed Abdul Latif of Hyderabad has put forward a scheme which does not envisage separate sovereignty for any part of India and as such is opposed by the main body of

the Muslim adherents of the Pakistan movement. It however involves an admission of the basic cultural differences between the Hindus and the Muslims. According to the author, "whatever the status India might achieve in the near future, whether 'Dominion Status' or 'Complete or full Independence,' it will be in her best interests that she should resolve herself into a Union with a federal form of constitution peculiar to Indian conditions"

Since Dr. Latif admits the application of the federal principle to India, his scheme has been vehemently opposed by the Muslim Pakistanis (or Paks as some call them). Consequently the scheme has been given much prominence by the Hindu elements that are opposed to separatism. Dr. Latif recommends that states should be formed out of British India and these states and those governed by Indian princes be regrouped, on the basis of cultural homogeneity in zonal federations "fitting into an All-India Union."

"Following the principle, and in view particularly of the political aspirations of the Muslims in the North-West and North-East of India, two of the sovereign states should be formed as under:

(*a*) A zonal federation composed of Sind, British Baluchistan, N.-W.F.P. and the Punjab.

(*b*) A zonal federation composed of Bengal and Assam."

The above two states will be federations with each constituent unit thereof being autonomous. Likewise Dr. Latif suggests the formation of other zonal federations as for instance that of Dravidian regions and others.

For states governed by the Indian princes Dr. Latif lays down that the large ones "will remain sovereign states and join the Union in their individual rights" The small ones "will either coalesce with contiguous states in British India or group themselves together for purposes of representation at the Centre though individually enjoying autonomy in internal affairs."

The "Centre", though allocated the "barest minimum" number of subjects, will yet control "(*a*) External Relations (*b*) Defence (*c*) Major Communications (*d*) Customs, etc." A proviso is provided in respect of Defence. Each state will have an army of its own, the strength of which "will be dependent on the importance of its startegic position." A part of each such army will be classed as Federal. "In normal times the military force in each state will be controlled by its own military department, and supervised by the Centre. But in times of war, full control will be assumed by the Centre." The Centre will control the Navy "subject to such concessions as the coastal states might need." The residuary powers will be allocated to the "federated states or units" which will be "fully autonomous" and will possess the right of secession.

Details about the safeguards for minorities and representation on legislatures have been given and exchange of population between the zones is suggested. The scheme was brought to the notice of the great Muslim leader, Mr. M.A. Jinnah, by the author. Mr. Jinnah thought the scheme "fundamentally different from the basic principle laid down in the Lahore Resolution of the All-India Muslim League."

The scheme is just another envisagement of the terms on which the Indian countries might be federated, while the basic principle involved in the Lahore Resolution is the complete elimination of any possibility of the Hindu majority encroaching on the rights of the Muslim section in their own homelands. The formation of a "Centre" with control of defence, communications and foreign relations is the direct negation of the Lahore Resolution which aims at putting these means of control over the national life of the Paks beyond the reach of the more numerous non-Muslims living in the boundaries of the Indian sub-continent.

Thus, from the point of view of the Lahore Resolution of the All-India Muslim League, the scheme can hardly be considered a tentative basis for further constitutional clarification. Indeed the Muslims have considerable justification in regarding it as an attempt (not necessarily conscious) to sabotage the Pakistan demand by conceding the form without realizing the spirit and intention of the demand.

Dr. Latif's scheme has been briefly outlined above to indicate how political development on modern lines has reached a stage when the incompatiability of national interests renders the conception of a unitary Government impossible for India.

The Aligarh Scheme

Professor Zafar-ul-Hasan and Dr. M.A.H. Qadri both of Aligarh proposed a detailed scheme for the partition of India based on the following premises:

"(1) That the Muslims of India are a nation by them-

selves. They have a distinct national unity wholly different from the Hindus and other non-Muslim groups . . .

(2) That the Muslims of India have a separate national future, and their own contributions to make for the betterment of the world;

(3) That the future of the Muslims of India lies in complete freedom from the domination of the Hindus, the British, or for the matter of that, any other people;

(4) That the Muslim majority provinces can not be allowed to be enslaved into a single All-India federation with an overwhelming Hindu majority at the Centre; and

(5) That the Muslims in the minority provinces shall not be allowed to be deprived of their separate religious, cultural and political identity and that they shall be given full and effective support by the Muslim majority provinces."

The Aligarh Scheme envisages the division of India into four entirely independent and sovereign states *viz.*, (1) Pakistan comprising the Punjab, the N.-W.F.P., Baluchistan, Sind, Kashmir and other Indian states lying in this region; (2) Bengal including portions of Bihar and Assam but excluding Howrah, Midnapore and Darjeeling districts. (3) Hyderabad comprising Hyderabad, Berar and Karnatak and (4) Hindustan comprising the rest of British India and Indian states.

The three sovereign states of Pakistan, Bengal and

Hindustan should enter into a defensive and offensive alliance on the basis of mutual recognition and reciprocity. Pakistan and Bengal should be recognised as the homelands of Muslims and Hindustan as the homeland of Hindus.

Safeguards for minorities are to be provided in all the above states. Each of the three states will have its own separate treaty of alliance with Britain.

The position of Hyderabad is quite exclusive. It must be recognized as a sovereign state in its own right and Berar and Karnatic taken from it by the British must be restored. A novel proposal contained in the scheme is that since most of the Muslims in Hindusthan live in large towns, all towns with over 50,000 population be declared "free cities".

The Sikandar Scheme

The late Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan published a proposal for the amendment of the Government of India Act, under the title, *Outlines of a Scheme of Indian Federation.* Like Dr. Latif's scheme the Sikandar Scheme does not carry out the basic intention of the Lahore Resolution and as its title—"Outlines of a scheme of Indian Federation" —suggests, the scheme stresses the necessity for acceptance of the federal principle. According to the scheme India should attain complete self-government not necessarily outside the British Empire. Sir Sinkandar has suggested the division of India into zones of a homogeneous character. The various zones are to be centralized in an All-India Federation. The following seven zones are proposed :

(1) Assam, a large part of Bengal, Bengal states and

Sikkim (Muslims 54%).

(2) Bihar, Orissa with portion of Bengal (Muslims 10%).

(3) United Provinces and U.P. states (Muslims 15%).

(4) Madras, Travancore, Madras states and Coorg (Muslims 7·1%).

(5) Bombay, Hyderabad, Western India States, Bombay States, Mysore and C P. States (Muslims 9%).

(6) Rajputana States, Gwalior, C P. States, Bihar and Orissa States, Central Provinces and Berar. (Muslims 5·6%).

(7) Punjab, Sind, N.-W.F.P , Kashmir, Baluchistan, Punjab States and Jaisalmer and Bikaner (Muslims 58·3%).

Each zone will have a Regional Legislature and representatives in the various regional legislatures will collectively constitute the Central Federal Legislative Assembly consisting of 375 members of which one-third will be Muslims. Likewise, of the Federal Executive consisting of the Viceroy and his Council of Ministers, one-third will be Muslims. In the Committee of Defence and External affairs the Muslims have a similar position.

The scheme presents a modification of the Government of India Act of 1935 without in any way involving a change in the basic principle. Now the scheme of fèderation as embodied in the Act of 1935 is, as stated by the Lahore Resolution of the League, "totally unsuited to and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and is al-

together unacceptable to Muslim India." The importance of the scheme for the purposes of the explanation of the Pakistan movement lies in its tacit recognition of the fact that Hindus and Muslims are not one nation and that being two nations they need different spheres of devolopment without mutual interference. In its insistence on safeguards it recognizes the fact that the interests of the minorities are not safe in the hands of the Hindus, but the safeguards it provides are manifestly ineffective.

To the Muslim Paks the scheme is altogether unacceptable. "A Punjabi" has written an astute appraisal of the scheme. He says, "The effect of this gerrymandering will be that it will set up a communal balance in the two zones while in the remaining five Hindu zones the overwhelming majorities of the Hindus will continue to remain undisturbed. If the Author's proposals are accepted the Muslims will lose everything in India, even in their homelands, the Muslim North-West and Muslim Bengal."

Sir Feroze Khan Noon's Proposal

In a speech delivered at Aligarh Sir Feroze Khan Noon outlined a proposal for a federation of five divisions of India. The "Dominions", as he termed the divisions, would be:

(1) Comprising the Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and the N.-W.F.P.

(2) Bengal and Assam;

(3) Central Provinces, United Provinces and Bihar;

(4) Bombay and

(5) Madras

The five dominions would nominate delegates to represent them at the Centre which would control defence, tariffs, foreign policy and currency.

Should any of the dominions not approve of the policy of the Centre, it will have the option to secede from the government—a very marked recognition of the necessity of not placing any of the Indian nationalities at the mercy of the majority-controlled centre.

It is however problematic if such a constitution would inspire minorities with sufficient confidence. The right to secede may be difficult of being translated into practice in view of the strength of the Federal authority which might be able to coerce any member unit to its will. The scheme however is as practical as any other and a further elaboration of it by the author or some other competent authority would be a valuable contribution to current political thought.

Other Plans and Proposals

In his *Thoughts on Pakistan* Dr. Ambedkar has admitted the justice and practicability of the Muslim League demand. He is all for recognising the independence and complete sovereignty of the Muslim homelands in the North-West and the East, but the boundaries between Pakistan and Hindustan suggested by him would exclude some regions with an effectual preponderance of Muslim interests. Should his views be accepted, there will remain a permanent question of Pak irredentism hardly compatible with the interests of peace and goodwill between the nation-states of the future.

The Bombay industrialist Sir Ardeshir Dalal would like to see India federated on the Canadian model with only the essential minimum number of subjects allocated to the centre. In the federal units the representation of various interests in the legislatures would be on a population basis while the Central Ministry—controlling defence, foreign relations, currency, credit, communications and customs—must have one-third representation of Muslims. Sir Ardeshir's plan is open to objection from the Muslim point of view in the same way as the Sikander Scheme, being an alternative federal plan envisaging a strong centre.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

The Wavell Plan

On 4th June, 1945, the Viceroy addressed the people of India in a broadcast speech. He announced that orders had been issued for the immediate release of members of the Congress Committee. He said that new proposals had been designed, firstly, to solve the political deadlock in India and secondly, to advance the country on its way to self-government. He proposed to call a conference of Indian Leaders to consider the formation of a new Executive Council, which should represent organised political opinion in India. For the first time it was proposed to give the Home and Finance portfolios to Indians. The portfolio for the External Affairs, which was then being held by the Viceroy, would also, in the new plan, be given to an Indian Member.

The Council, excepting the Viceroy and the Commader-in-Chief, would be entirely Indian. There would be an equal proportion of Caste Hindus and Muslims. A British High Commissioner would represent British interests in India. The Viceroy made it clear that the formation of this interim government would not in any way prejudice the final constitutional settlement.

The Viceroy invited the following to the Viceregal Lodge in order to assemble the conference on the 25th June, at Simla:

Premiers of Provincial governments; or for provinces under Section 93 government, those who last held office as Premier: the leader of the Congress Party and the Deputy Leader of the Muslim League Party in the Central Assembly; The Leader of the Congress Party and the Muslim League in the Council of State; and the Leaders of the Nationalist Party and the European Group in the Assembly; Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah as the recognised leaders of the two main political parties; Rao Bahadur N. Siva Raj to represent the Sehedule Classes and Master Tara Singh to represent the Sikhs.

The Viceroy appealed to the people of India, to work to evolve an atmosphere of goodwill and to forgive and forget on all sides, so that the Conference might succeed. The sincere and dignified words of the soldier-stateman produced a deep impression on both the Hindus and Muslims, and lent a hopeful aspect to the situation. There was apparent jubilation in Hindu India, and the Hindu press was hopeful that the Congress would return to power. The incompatabilities in the Congress facade and reality led to a few face-saving objections by the Congress leaders who were apparently pleased at the prospect of gaining power.

There was a humorous as well as tragic aspect to the omission of the puppet Muslim Congress President, the 'show-boy' kept to convince the world the Congress was representative of the Muslims as well as the Hindus, from among the invitees. Mr. Gandhi affected surprise and indignation that the Congress President had not been invited while he 'an individual' had been allowed to eclipse that

eminent gentleman in importance. Other Congress leaders, whose smiling photographs were appearing in the Congress press, likewise declared themselves shocked at the forgetfulness of the British Government. So the omission was rectified and Rashtrapati Abul Kalam Azad was invited. Indeed, the government went one better: they provided an R A F. 'plane to take the Rashtrapati in state to Simla.

Another objection for which Mr. Gandhi gave the cue, was to the use of the word 'Caste Hindus' in the Viceroy's broadcast. Mr. Gandhi said, "I claim that there is no such person, speaking politically as a "Caste Hindu"—I can only hope, therefore, that H.E. the Viceroy has allowed himself to make use of the expression in utter ignorance." Perhaps, the Viceroy, despite his "utter ignorance" was yet aware of the sixty million depressed human beings to which Caste Hindus have applied the terrible apellation of "Untouchables" for countless centuries, whose treatment at the hands of Caste Hindus is a standing blot on the human race, who have been degraded far below the level of animals so that the Caste Hindu who worship the cow, the snake, the monkey and other animal forms, considers himself polluted if some of these unfortunate "untouchables" come within a hundred yards of him or are even seen* by him. Yet these "untouchables," some of whom

* "In this (Tinnevelly) district there is a class of unseeables called Purada Vannans. They are not allowed to come out during day time because their sight is considered polution."—"The Hindu" of Dec. 24th, 1932.

The Census of India Report 1931, from which the above is taken,

are indeed " unseeable," are claimed by Mr. Gandhi as one politically with their terrible oppressors. Mr. Gandhi said that the expression Caste Hindu " offended his ear ". Is Mr. Gandhi's sense of justice not offended when he proposes to give over sixty million so-called " untouchables " into the domination of their heartless tyrants?

However, the Congress could exploit the world in its favour, since they could always say, as many did, that the Muslims who were a minority community had been given a parity of representation with the Hindus, while in actual fact, the Schedule Classes, and Sikh representatives, would, with the Caste Hindus, outweigh Muslim representation.

The Congress Working Committee met and declared its readiness to participate in the conference. Mr. Gandhi met the Viceroy but said he would not attend the Conference though he would remain in Simla as " an advisor."

The Muslim leaders on the other hand, were reticent and the Muslim public perplexed and worried. Any Pan-Indian arrangement would be fatal to their goal of separate self-determination in their vast homelands. The total number of seats in the proposed Council was not known, and the relative strength of the Muslim quota indeterminable. There was no doubt that the Scheduled Classes, Sikh and other communities' representatives would augment the Caste Hindus in opposition to the Muslim separationist movement, and the Pan-Indian Central Executive

says with reference to this caste..." its unfortunate members are compelled to follow nocturnal habits, leaving their dens after dark and scuttling home at the false dawn like the badger, hyæna or aard-vark."

would be dominated by a Congress majority, so that in any ultimate constitutional settlement following this interim arrangement, there was small hope of the Muslim territories ever becoming free from Congress imperial domination.

The leader's Conference met on the 25th, 26th and the 27th. The general principles of the Wavell Plan regarding the duties, scope and objectives of the Executive Council were tentatively accepted. On the 29th, the Conference met again and the Presidents of the League and the Congress informed the Viceroy that the two bodies had failed to come to an understanding. The Viceroy desired that the leaders submit a panel of names for his consideration. The Muslim League did not join the Congress and other parties in agreeing to submit a panel of names. The Conference was adjourned to the 14th July.

Explaining the stand that he had taken at the Conference Mr. Jinnah said, "We have no illusions about this parity because on the Executive Council, as proposed, the Muslim quota will not be more than one third and in the whole of the Executive Council, Muslims will be a minority of one-third. Whereas the Hindu quota will be in parity with Muslims, there will be Scheduled Castes representation and Sikh representation, and we do not know yet which other community or communities will procure representation because the strength of the new Executive Council is yet to be determined.

"We are willing to make full contribution to any just and reasonable settlement. The Congress has already claimed the right to choose member or members from the

Muslim 'bloc', and some other party or parties may make similar claims. While we have every desire to find a solution, this is a point, namely, that the Congress or any other body should be entitled to choose Muslims from the Muslim 'bloc' is one, which we cannot accept either on principle or on facts as they are before us."

Mr. Jinnah explained that the Scheduled castes had grievance of social tyranny and economic oppression in Hindu society, but they had the same political goal as the Caste Hindus so they would not have any bias for the political aims of the Muslims, and the Congress would, on many important matters, be safely entitled to count on their support. The Sikhs had declared themselves against the granting of separate self-determination to Muslims in their homelands, so their political aim too was the same as that of the Congress. Then there were other communities and the two British members, the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief. "The composition of this Council will therefore be such as to enable the Congress invariably to command a majority," Mr. Jinnah said. There was the Viceroy's veto, but it was absurd to expect that the Viceroy would exercise this veto constantly and as a normal business. "There is no adequate provision, declared Mr. Jinnah, "against the Congress forcing their decisions by a majority vote against the Muslim 'bloc'. Therefore, we will have to consider how to provide against this position." "Mussalmans desire honestly to come to a settlement and not play with facts. And I do not think it can possibly be denied that 99% of the Mussalmans of India are with the

League. We have not lost a single bye-election except one that was in the early days of 1937, out of about 70 bye-elections. The total number of Muslim members in all the Provincial Legislatures is somewhere about 600, and out of them there are only about 30 who are Congressite Muslims and who happened to be in one or other Provincial Legislature.

"I am told that in the Central Legislature, there is not a single Congressite Muslim from a Muslim electorate. There are two Muslims who have been returned by joint electorates. We maintain therefore, that the Muslim League alone and nobody else is entitled to give the names for the entire Muslim 'bloc' to the Viceroy. There cannot be unanimity in this world."

The League Working Committee anxiously asked for elucidations about the number of seats allotted to the Muslims, and wanted surety of acceptance for its nominees. The Congress Working Committee, on the other hand, went to work with high hopes of gaining power and submitted a panel of names. Insisting on their claim to represent all communities, they included three Muslim Leaguers in the panel. The League's request for elucidation and assurances was turned down by the Viceroy and the League refused to submit a panel. The League Executive however decided to attend the Conference on the 14th July. On the 11th the Viceroy showed Mr. Jinnah the list of Muslim members selected by him, but Mr. Jinnah expressed his inability to accept the Viceroy's selection. The League Working Committee had gone so far as to be prepared to

accept the plan even though it gave them the position of a one-third minority in the Central Executive; but they were absolutely firm that there should be no further weakening of their position, and that all the Muslim members should be selected by the Muslim League. The Viceroy was unable to give this guarantee. The Conference had failed to arrive at an agreement.

In one of this bitterest and most incisive statements, the President of All-India Muslim League explained his stand. Clear-cut argumentation and blunt analysis are the noted attributes of his genius, but the vehemence and causticity of his tone indicated how deeply he was disappointed. His gift for gathering up a nabulous side-issue in a quintessential phrase and fitting in its proper place in the stark unity of his argument never appeared better than in the statement he issued to the press, Mr. Jinnah said:

"On the examination and analysis of the Wavell plan, we found that it was a snare.

"There was the combination consisting of Gandhi-Hindu Congress, who stand for India's Hindu national independence as one India and the latest exponent of geographical unity, Lord Wavell, and Glancy-Khizr, who are bent upon creating disruption among the Muslims in the Punjab, and we were sought to be pushed into this arrangement, which, if we had agreed to, as proposed by Lord Wavell, we should have signed our death warrant.

"For, let us honestly examine the Wavell Plan. Our stand has been, and we have repeatedly made it clear to the British Government times out of number since '40 that

we cannot consider or enter into any provisional interim government, unless a declaration is made by the British Government guaranteeing the right of self-determination of the Muslims and pledging that after the war, or so soon as it may be possible, the British Government would establish Pakistan having regard to the basic principles laid down in the Lahore Resolution of Muslim League, passed in March '40. This was condition precedent No. 1 to our considering any provisional arrangement.

"The second condition was that we are not a minority but a nation, and we can only enter into provisional arrangement having regard to the necessities and exigencies of moment created by the war and fully co-operate in the prosecution of the war and that in any arrangement we claimed equal number in the proposed executive.

"The Wavell proposals set at nought both these conditions and called upon us to make the severest sacrifice. I know that he in his broadcast said that these proposals are without prejudice to any future constitution or constitutions of India. While in one breath it is impressed upon us that these proposals are without prejudice to and do not prejudge the Pakistan issue, yet the plan in fact contradicts this in the next breath by its very terms.

"It is obvious to any intelligent man that if we accept this arrangement the Pakistan issue will be shelved and put in cold storage indefinitely, whereas the Congress will have secured under this arrangement what they want, a clear road for their advantage towards securing Hindu national independence of India. Because the future executive will

work as a unitary Government of India, we know that this interim or provisional arrangement will have a way of settling down for an unlimited period, and all the forces in the proposed executive plus the known policy of the British Government, and Lord Wavell's strong inclination for a united India, would completely jeopardize us, for, I will quote Mr. Amery, who has tried his best but in the result has given us cold comfort and his statement is a very clear indication and a pointer to British policy. Speaking in the House of Commons, where he presented the White paper, he said as follows:

"'The idea which we have always looked on is that of an all-India union in which the States would play their full part. At the same time we have also recognised the possibility that agreement between Hindus and Muslims in an any form of an Indian unity may be unattainable. Any interim advance therefore must in no way prejudge the question whether the ultimate settlement is based on an united or divided India.'

"Next, in the proposed Executive, we should be reduced to a minority of one-third, all the other minorities, such as the Scheduled Castes, Sikh and Christians have the same goal as the Congress. They have their grievances as minorities, but their goal and ideology is and cannot be different from or otherwise than that of united India. Ethnically and culturally they are very closely knitted to the Hindu society. I am not against full justice being done to all the minorities and they should be fully safeguarded and protected as such, wherever they may be. But in the actual

working and practice, invariably their vote will be against us and there is no safeguard for us except the Viceroy's veto, which it is well-known to any constitutionalist, cannot be exercised lightly as every day business against majority decisions with regard to the policy and the principles that will have to be laid down and measures adopted, both administrative and legislative.

"On the top of this came the last straw on the camel's back that even about the five members of the Muslims 'bloc' which were allotted to us communal wise, which is the essence of Wavell proposals, we were told that the Muslim League was not entitled to nominate all the Muslim representatives as our chosen spokesmen and there were two claimants - the Congress, which claimed two, and Glancy-Khizr on behalf of the Punjab claimed one. This move on the part of these two went at the very root and the very existence of the Muslim League regarding its position character and status. But finally we broke as Lord Wavell insisted upon his having one non-Leaguer nominee of Malik Khizr Hayat representing Punjab Muslims.

"As I have said it is only the blind who cannot see that the All-India Muslim League is the only authoritative representative organisation of the Muslims. If we had accepted this position as presented to us by Lord Wavell we would have emerged out of this conference minus every thing and we would have betrayed our people. It would have been an abject surrender on our part for all we stand for and it would have been a death-knell to the Muslim League. This was the position which forced us and we found that it was impossible for us to accept this arrangement."

CONCLUSION

Politically India has remained a part of the medieval world longer than any other similar region. The political renascence in India began towards the end of the Nineteenth Century when contact with Europe led to the introduction of the western ideas of racial and territorial patriotism.

As late as the beginning of the Twentieth Century the sentiment of patriotism (to use the word in the modern sense) was confined to the microscopic westernized upper class, while the masses retained the old world values and the catholicity of outlook characteristic of the oriental peoples. The number of those who felt that their self-respect demanded that they should worship the homeland and hate all foreigners, was extremely small. One often came across people who would talk of their own country in deprecating terms while they were loud in praising Europe and all things European, without realising that their attitude would no longer be looked upon as being due to enlightened modesty. With eyes on the eternal values, the Indians of an older day were too broad-minded to set up barriers between man and man.

But the march of European ideas could not long be delayed. As the older men died out, the younger generation in schools and colleges read about men and women whose nationality was more important than their humanity, and ideas of racial and territorial distictiveness began to spread.

In the towns a considerable class was coming into being who along with the worship of the homeland, also possessed the other complement of western patriotism, viz , an unreasoning dislike of those who did not belong to their own racial or territorial group. It was this fast growing class who propagated the notion that toleration of the foreigners was not hospitality, or humanity, but was looked upon as servility and degradation among modern 'civilized' races.

Political consciousness spread among the Indian masses at a rapid pace after the World War of 1914-18. Agitation and unrest were the external symptoms of this awakening. Now after a quarter of a century of evolution on modern lines the Indian peoples have arrived at a new stage of political development. Their patriotism has become intenser and more localised. To-day the average man is not merely an Indian, but is also acutely aware of his being a member of a racial or territorial group as a Bengali or Punjabi or Mahratta. As El Hamza has pointed out,* the Indian Nations are being born in these transitional times.

The sentiment (regretted by supporters of Pan-Indian unity) of "provincialism"—or attachment to one's own province and discrimination against inhabitants of other provinces in favour of those belonging to one's own—prevails among the masses as well as the intelligentzia Apparently the heterogenous agglomeration of races and countries that is known as India, has arrived at the national stage. Historically a parallel for India can be drawn from Renascence Europe when the European nations were in the pro-

* Pakistan : A Nation.

cess of making. India is larger than Europe without Russia and the diversity of race, language, sociological tradition and geographical environment in India is much greater than in Europe. It seems inevitable that political evolution in India should result in the growth of nationalism, and various cultural groups should try to form nation-states in their respective territories.

In recent times these tendencies have produced concrete results. Ceylon, despite close proximity and common history, is not only separate from India but Ceylonese (or Sinhalese) nationalism has even assumed an exclusionist and aggressive form, and has resulted, in some respects (e.g. employment of Indian labour) in the adoption of an anti-Indian policy. Likewise Burmese nationhood came of age and resulted in Burma being separated from India in 1937 and being placed under the Secretary of State as a distinct political unit. Other Indian nations also imbibed western political tenets and the Mongolo-Dravidian Muslims of East India and the Aryan Muslims of the North-West began to grow conscious of their separate national entities. The last nation (so far) to voice their claim for self-determination are the Dravidians of the South.

Oppositition to these claims has mainly come from the Hindustanese or Aryo-Drividian people of the Ganges Valley and Central India, who by reason of their numbers, geographical position and natural resources would dominate in a pan-Indian state. The big block of Rajput states maintain their traditional distinctiveness, while the Scytho-Dravidian people of Western India (Maharashtra)

are a potential nation. At present the Mahrattas and Rajputs are siding with the Hindustanese in opposing Pakistan, but in all probability, these two great peoples will, in the future, form independent nation-states.

European nations were born out of the medieval chaos after centuries of strife. Is it to too much to expect that Indian nations will come into existence through a peaceful and orderly process? It is possible that there will be much violence and bloodshed before the various racial and cultural groups recognise one another's rights, though it is not impossible that with the example of Europe before them, the Indians should be wiser and lay the foundations of future peace by being just to one another.

THE END